

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XI.

JANUARY, 1907.

No. 1.

---

## THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL IN THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

(Concluded.)

To His Church the Holy One has given the *correct means of being constituted and made one*: "I have given them *Thy Word* and I pray for them, not only for them, but also for all who *by their Word* believe on me, that they may be one," John 17. Thus the Church is made, constituted, and forever kept together by the Word, not by a confession. This Church — and this only — can make a true confession of what constitutes her. That is the psychological order. We presume that Dr. Richard is able to give from memory a correct Lutheran definition of the Church, but not being of it he stumbles when he steps up to her from a different direction — here from the relation of Church and doctrine. We may mark his way of proving the prevalence of free-will by the confessions as unacknowledged rationalism. Let us hang it low, that he who runs may read. We quote Dr. Richard: "It is in part" — what are the remains? — "with the hope of making at least a small contribution to the inculcation of the principles stated above" (that Lutherans must be clocks never striking and ticking alike) "that we now advance to the discussion of the subject placed at the head of this article (The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will), and we begin with the year 1530, for prior to that time there was no Lutheran Church, but only Lutherans, who were united in opposition to the teaching of the Roman Catholic

Church, rather than in a distinct program of their own. Indeed, prior to 1530 there was no general confession of faith among Lutherans, no single bond that held them together and constituted them a Church." We may be allowed to interject a few pricks in the form of questions into this corollary of historical assumptions. Where was, prior to 1530, the Church that Christ founded and of which He said the gates of hell should not prevail against her? Was it yet the Roman Church, and were its opposers the gates of hell let loose? Was Luther at Worms a traitor to the Church, or a confessor of the Church? Was he the founder of a new church, or was he at this time the whole Church? For all these questions, which arise out of above "historical" assertion, Romanists will have a ready answer, while Christians must bow their heads in shame! Another series of questions suggested by a reading of the above make a Lutheran despair, for instance: How could Lutherans recognize each other as being of the Church, when there was no Lutheran Church prior to 1530? How could Lutherans come together and act in unison at confessing their faith, if they had no single common bond? How could they know their faith, or the faith of the Church they were to confess? Was Melanchthon the one who knew it, made it up for the princes by whom it was imposed on their subjects? These questions are easily disposed of when we know that the Word of God is the creator of the Church, the faith it has, the bond of all its believers, that constitutes them a Church — confession or no confession in writing. But they will empty the deepest well of psychology, recurring again and again, if the Confession assumes the prerogatives of the Word. The Confession, therefore, remains with a true Lutheran a document of faith to be explained in the sense of the Scripture, neither placed in lieu of it, nor placed on a par with private writings, nor explained according to them. The latter we would rather interpret, if possible, according to the sense of the Confession as long as their authors continue to affirm their adherence to it. We would extend such charity even to Dr. Richard, if his devia-



tions were not so glaringly and boastfully displayed. Only an unbeliever can maintain that the Church makes her faith by creeds, and it is a blasphemy of the Holy One and His Word that a Confession creates and constitutes His Church. It is a psychological impossibility to use the Augsburg Confession as documentary evidence for the maintenance of contrary teachings found in private writings.

After clearing up the right relation between the Augustana and the Church on the one hand, and the Augustana and the private writings of its confessors on the other, we now advance to what Dr. Richard regards as the strongest proof, that some free-will (remember: in spiritual things) was the old Lutheran doctrine, because it prevailed between 1530 and 1560, namely: It must be found in the 18th Article, because "it prevailed among the teachers who wrote the Augsburg Confession and continued to affirm it." We must remind him strongly that we have severed the Confession from the private writings of its author and other adherents. It never was Melancthon's book, as he was reminded by Luther, but the Church's book. It stands in a special category as the faith confessed by the Church. As we have shown on what authority it rests and what authority for us we may give it, we intend to examine it in the light of the Word of God and find out if its expression covers as much as was necessary, at that time, to confess. The point of controversy with us cannot be: "Is the doctrine of free-will *in rebus divinis* contained in the Augsburg Confession, because it prevailed among teachers who wrote it and continued to affirm it?" but: Does the Augsburg Confession either explicitly or impliedly contain, as part of the scriptural doctrine set forth in it, the doctrine of free-will *in rebus divinis*, or the ability of natural man to accomplish more or less of spiritual works? We subjoin the last clause, as we infer from Dr. Richard's utterances that he has no clear conception of free-will, and might understand us to say that man does not act *in any way*, neither resisting in his bound will, nor doing, when his will has come to life (faith and sanctification). We

surely believe that spiritual man, created by the power of God through the Word, moves, acts, chooses, and does everything commanded by God, and this he does not by any other mind or will than by the same by which he, in his unconverted state, rejected God's proffered grace, in which state and activities it is sustained also solely by the power of God through the Word. If Dr. Richard has not known this fact of our teaching thus far, we are glad to inform him of this fact, and beg him to store it in his memory. We simply deny with the Confession that man *acts* in any way *together with* the Holy Spirit in the spiritual act of getting to life (conversion—faith) and *in the moving* to spiritual works. This, we assert and are going to prove, is contained in the Augsburg Confession, explained by the Holy Scripture, of whose doctrines it claims to be an exhibition. Dr. Richard says: The private writings explicitly and impliedly teach free-will, *i. e.*, man with his own powers cooperates somewhat and somehow toward his salvation; therefore the Augsburg Confession cannot but contain, explicitly and impliedly, the same doctrine, if read without interpolation. We beg to assure him that we are not going to read things into the Confession which are not in it. But must we not suspect him at the outset of interpolation when he is going to look at it through the private writings and their *supposed* teaching of free-will, the baselessness of which supposition we have no space to show?

Taking up the reasons of Dr. Richard we beg to acknowledge gladly that the teaching therein of un-free-will is not enforced by such strong language as Luther used in his private writings and as was afterward found necessary in the Form of Concord against such as intended to pervert the sense of the early Confession and which we must employ against Dr. Richard. We purposely are glad; for it favors beforehand in an inargumentative way our contention versus Dr. Richard that at this time there was *no one among* the confessors *disputing* (at least not openly) the teaching of un-free-will in the Church confessing. The contention of Dr. Richard that this strong language



was *purposely* omitted, *because it did not prevail*, we assign, without hesitation, to the deepest limbo of psychological enigmas in Dr. Richard's historical research. We rather praise the confessors for being suave in manner though strong in the matter, as will appear further on. They had, by their manner of confessing, to make the most favorable impression on friends and foes alike, to stop the caviling of their formidable oppressors, win the favor of the undecided, and retain the trust of all for whom they were confessing—the Church. And they did it. Glorious spectacle this! They did it by their modesty and suavity. Every true confession of the Church has this halo of modesty and suavity about it, and we ask Dr. Richard to point out the want of it even in the Form of Concord.

How glad Luther felt about this grace of the Confession we gather from his comment, when it was sent to him for approval: "I have read Magister Philip's Apology, which pleases me well and find nothing to correct nor to change; would also be unfit; for I cannot step so graciously and softly. Christ, our Lord, may make it bring forth much and large fruit, for which we hope and pray. Amen." As Dr. Richard enlarges greatly on the fact, that the Confession does not contain any likening of man "to a stone, block, and statue," and on this ground takes it for granted that it *must contain* free-will in divine matters, and is afraid someone might read such likening into it, we disclaim any intention of this kind. We confess at once: These to him obnoxious words are not in it, though we entirely disagree with him as to the historical motive of such omission.

But for all that we are not going to let Dr. Richard squeeze the 18th Article of the Augsburg Confession until he gets, not the juice, but the wood-pulp. We quote it: "Of free-will it is taught that in some sense man has free-will outwardly to live honorably and to choose among things which reason comprehends; but without the grace, assistance, and operation of the Holy Spirit man is not able to become pleasing to God, to fear God heartily, or to believe in Him, or to cast the evil inborn

concupiscence out of his heart; but such things are effected through the Holy Spirit, who is given through the Word of God." We wish to state that we abide by these very words without omission, interpolations, or mental reading between its lines from anything outside.

Unhappily we cannot say the same of Dr. Richard. He has extracted the following sense out of it: "First. It *vindicates* the *essential* freedom of the human will, in that it declares that man, that is, the natural man, has the power of choice. . . . It is the power by which he determines to hear and to meditate on the Word of God, which is the *conditio sine qua non* of his becoming a Christian." The part left out is filled up by a psychological disquisition.

We are not concerned in it, much as Dr. Richard wants us to be. The quoted words are to be the sense of the first clause of the 18th Article. That they *must* be in, because of their prevalence at the time, is fortified by a quotation from Melanchthon's *De Anima* (C. R. 3, 153) where Melanchthon gives a *general definition* of the will, from whence Dr. Richard argues the *possession of free-will in divine things, because Melanchthon applies not the stock, stone, and statue likening to the natural man*, but ascribes *velle ac nolle* to man and states his ability to regulate his external actions in regard to what *seems* good or evil, Melanchthon thereby clearly indicating that the whole disquisition does not pertain to the question in hand. "It is therefore Lutheran to affirm that the human will possesses the inherent power of choice made known to the understanding (reason)." We believe this latter announcement partly to be true, that is, in regard to natural things and actions, but not to the extent Dr. Richard wants, as the Confession limits this inherent power to "*power in some sense*," namely, to lead an outwardly honorable life and to choose in things which reason comprehends, explaining what those things are by a quotation from Augustine: "He may will or choose or not will or choose to labor in the field, eat and drink, dress so or so, marry, raise cattle, and numerous other things that



are good for this life, and he may will to do evil things: to worship an idol, to murder, and so on."

Now as to the first part of what he styles "the explicit statement of the Confession," viz.: "It vindicates the essential freedom of the human will, in that it declares that man, that is, natural man, has the power of choice." The Confession, to a plain reader, says just the reverse. To him it appears that it is not the object of the Confession to "vindicate" the essential freedom of the human will, but that statement is the incidental reflection back of a much greater and weightier matter *allowing some freedom* for the human will, the power of which in spiritual things is to be altogether denied. No mention is made of any "essential" freedom, but it is limited by the Confession to freedom "in some sense," not even extending it to all matters of this life. But of the second part of Dr. Richard's "explicit statement of the Confession," that the human will is "the power by which he determines to hear and to meditate on the Word of God," *not one word* is found in the Confession. It is silent as the grave. It is altogether a fabrication of Dr. Richard, which he has interpolated, "read into the Confession." From the Word of God, by which we are bound to get the sense of the Confession, it appears that hearing and meditating on the Word of God is a spiritual activity (Luke 11, 28; John 6, 45; 8, 37, etc.), which is excluded from the human will in its natural state by the second clause of the 18th Article, enforced anon of this spiritual work in the German text of the Confession by the passage 2 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man perceiveth" (= heareth, meditateth, understandeth) "not the things of the Spirit of God" (*i. e.*, the Gospel). Dr. Richard's argument for the prevalence of his old Lutheran doctrine that man has free-will in spiritual things, falls flat, in so far as his "explicit statement" of the same in the first confession is missing.

We now proceed to his second so-called "implied statement of the Confession" of his doctrine of free-will, which he finds in the second clause of the 18th Article, interpreted, of

course, through private writings thus: "That by such grace, assistance, and operation he (natural man) *can do* these things that are required of him in his relation to God. The *underlying* idea is that grace imparts strength and power to the will, and this it does by illumining the understanding and by impact as of personality upon personality." (Of this last we have no cognizance. We only know that the Holy Ghost operated upon us by the Word. If Dr. Richard's personality has been worked upon by "impact of the Holy Spirit's personality" we will not dispute it at present as out of our way. But perhaps this Zwinglian leaven causes his befuddling in the matter at issue.) This "implied statement" he has also fortified by a quotation from *De Anima* (C. R. 13, 162; we cannot verify it, but assume it to be correctly given), in which Melancthon affirms that the Holy Spirit does not create a new faculty of will, but operates upon the same faculty which man has in natural matters under the bondage of Satan, renewing it for use in spiritual things. We have no quarrel with Melancthon on this point, but we add that such renewing operation is called in Scripture a creation (Ps. 51, 11: "Create in me a clean heart") and the renewed heart a *new heart* (Jer.) a new man, a new creature.

According to Dr. Richard, this means "that the human will is *stimulated* and *energized* by the Holy Spirit and *made competent* for action" and considers it "the *plain* and common-sense meaning of the Confession" though it is only "the implied statement" as he had said a few lines ahead. As an authority he affirms: "As such it must be regarded." And yet, certain he is only "that the absolute passivity of the will is neither expressed nor implied in the 18th Article." Under these circumstances we may join issue with his authority.

Now a plain reader, who is not well versed in reading between the lines nor has the spectacles of private writings on hand, will get the following sense out of the words of the 18th Article: Man has *some*—not all—free-will to conduct his outward life according to what he understands by his reason; but (an opposing and excluding conjunction in all kinds of



grammar) he is *not able* (opposed by "but" to free-will in matters of reason, it can but mean: has no free will or ability) to become pleasing, fearing, and believing God heartily, or to cast out of his heart (the special seat of the evil will: Matt. 15, 9) the inborn evil concupiscence (the will to do evil), save by the grace, assistance, and operation of the Holy Spirit, who works through the Word (not through any "impact of personality upon personality"). If this sense is not founded on the words of the Confession, we have no means to know what words say. Worldly men, like Talleyrand, may use words to conceal their thoughts, but we do not expect it from confessors of Christian Truth. We run on this horn of the dilemma proposed by Dr. Richard without a shiver. The composers of the Confession may be, for what we do not know, the worst knaves and rogues, but here they were the greatest saints: confessors of God's Truth. (Cf. for a scriptural example Peter, Matt. 16, 16—23.) All of Dr. Richard's erudition *cannot change the words* and to the *words* of the Confession we cling, even to those which have, with him, such a Pickwickian meaning. We ask Dr. Richard: Do we find the words: Man "*can do* these things" in the Augsburg Confession? Do the words: The will is "stimulated," "energized," "made competent for action," occur in the 18th Article, or are they synonyms for any words used therein? As a reasonable man he will answer: No, they are "the underlying idea."

Now we hold that there are, for some truths expressed, underlying ideas, *i. e.*, other truths. They lie at the bottom of the superstructure. They are the causes, or reasons, including the smaller truth, but never opposed to the expression of the same. The 18th Article expresses with so many words the truth: Man is not able to do spiritual works. Can this be grounded on Dr. Richard's "underlying idea": Man *can do* these spiritual works? Not by any means. The cause cannot be the opposite of the effect, as Dr. Richard's underlying idea is to the 18th Article. It is extracted from the antonyms of the expressions of the truth and put beside the truth nullify-

ing it. We will give the underlying idea of the words of the Confession in the last clause of the 18th Article, the same of which Dr. Richard has given them. The Holy Spirit through the Word "*is given*" (*concipitur* = received), because natural man has Him not nor His Word and activities, "assists," because man is unable to do what he ought, and "operates on man's will," because it is bound, yea, dead in trespasses and sins, without power to operate. The underlying idea of the truth expressed by the 18th Article, that man is not able to do spiritual works is given by the 2d Article of the Confession: "Of Original Sin: Further they teach that after the fall of Adam all men naturally born are conceived and born in sin, that is, that they all from their mother's womb are *full* of concupiscence and evil propensities and have not by nature true fear of God nor true faith in God." The 18th Article cannot but confess the truth arising out of this general truth in regard to the will of man in conversion. Standing on the bed-rock of the Scriptural truth confessed in the 2d Article, it gives a clear note: Because man's will is unable, the Holy Spirit does all. It gives no explanation, because Scripture supplies none.

We have to say a few words on how Dr. Richard gets at his "underlying idea," that the human will cooperates in spiritual works. He sublimates it by a mysterious psychology from the words "assists" and "assistance (*Hilfe* = *auxilium*)."

According to Dr. Richard (*Luth. Quarterly*, Jan., 1904) we have not advanced to this newly invented psychology. Therefore we want to look at it closely and set it down for our inspection. "The activity of the will under such divine operation is clearly implied, otherwise there would be no meaning in the word 'assistance,' and conversion would be *per modum coactionis* (compulsory). . . . The will must decide. . . . Otherwise, conversion is left without ethical content, and the abiding in sin is without responsibility. . . . Its own conduct (*Verhalten*) now determines its destiny." Let us see: If the Doctor "assists" some wayfaring Willy by an alms, the beggar has acted, assisted, or helped the Doctor, because the beggar *decided*



to take or lay hold on (*concupitur*) the bounty. The Doctor's "assistance" could be no alone activity of his and absolute passivity of the tramp, but implied the activity of the tramp, otherwise there would be no meaning in the word "assistance," and the reception of the gift would be compulsory. Therefore the tramp "assisted" in the assistance. They "assisted" each other. It was the Doctor-ward and tramp-ward side of the Doctor's "assistance," according to a later dictum of Dr. Richard. Thus we have set the psychology of assistance before our mind. But as the worst tramp would decline such psychological honors, our will declines such honor from Dr. Richard in conversion. We need a conversion by the Holy Spirit in His way of assistance, which we show in the following manner: If I assist a man found lying on the road with a broken leg and bring him to a surgeon, *I* do the assisting alone. It is my activity. If he says: "I will assist you by *deciding to allow* you to help me," I will call him impudent or consider him mad from pain, yet try to help him, but *let him alone if he resists*. My underlying idea (and I should insist that it be his also) is, when I help or assist him, *that he cannot help himself*. In my act of assisting he can do nothing. He may have all his will, but it is unavailing, powerless. My assistance is my "alone activity" and his assistance "absolute passivity." *My* good will only comes into consideration, his will not in the least. According to Dr. Richard's logic his will is of the highest importance in my saving him. His salvation would be without ethical content. But we must insist that the ethical content lies wholly on my side, and he gets the benefit. This is all he needs, and it would be no compulsion either. Wholly aside from my assistance it is when the fallen and helpless man rejects my proffered aid. In *his rejection* his will enters even to preventing my assistance, and he must bear all responsibility. The consequences rest on him alone. By applying this to the conversion of man, it will be seen that alone activity and absolute passivity is "the underlying idea" of the word "assist," used in the 18th Article of the Confession enforced in front by the grace and in the rear by

the operation of the Holy Spirit both in the acts of conversion (getting faith) and sanctification. This doctrine is in the Augsburg Confession, therefore the old Lutheran doctrine. If Dr. Richard cannot see it, we must beg him to revise his psychological conception and to rely on the words instead of hunting for some cabalistic meaning in accordance with private writings. Until then we call his "ethical content" of conversion "the pride of mortal, that rushes in where angels fear to tread."

We must as yet look into the historical facts for the maintenance of Dr. Richard's contention that free-will *in rebus divinis* is in the Augsburg Confession and therefore the old Lutheran doctrine, though we confess only to a smattering of historical knowledge and have no means of verifying our data. This argument is based on the same psychology noted above. It is to be "in," because it prevailed; and because some very different bedfellows held it, therefore it prevailed. We condense it: The Romanists found no fault with the 18th Article, and the Protestant confessors did not object to their doing so, therefore the Protestants understood it in the sense of the Romanists. It must thus contain free-will in spiritual matters, because Romanists cling strenuously to it. Dr. Richard has proved all, immensely more than he needs to do. Aristotle was childish when he ruled: "Probatur magis, probatur nihil."

Now for the single historical facts of Dr. Richard. "In both cases (in the two confutations of the Augsburg Confession, the first and that of August 3) they (the Roman confutators) state how they understand the article *De Libero Arbitrio*, that is, essentially as Melancthon had explained in his private writings of 1527—'30." But if they say so, he has failed to quote their correct sayings. He cites from the first Confutation only the words: "Sana et catholica est haec assertio principium," and he adds: "and warn against the determinism expressed in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and the first edition of Melancthon's *Loci*. Have they really had in mind only the editio prima? We would like Dr. Richard to be explicit, if they did so. But the confutators do say nothing "that they



*understood the article as Melancthon had explained free-will.*" We at least are thoroughly at sea as to that from their quoted words. Much less than that, the confutators of August 3d express: "*Quae confessio acceptatur et approbatur.*" Thus the giant's assertion sweeps far wider than his cited quotation. It is for the *largest* part unproved. If the component integral part of the whole is unproved, the whole is unproved. But what *seems* to be proved, according to the giant's quotation, is, that if we must accept the confutators as sincere and understanding what they say, the 18th Article of the Confession is thoroughly Roman, that is: "that the moral nature of man through the Fall is *somewhat weakened*, yet man has as yet the freedom of will for choice between good and evil. He has strength to withstand evil concupiscence, to do the good, and to *cooperate* to his conversion." (Rohnert's Dogmatik, p. 218.) If this is true, Luther might have spared his trouble at reforming the Church, and the confessors the trouble to confess.

Now comes the witness of the confessors to such interpretation. The Lutheran parties of the Committee of Reconciliation (two princes, two jurists, three theologians) "reported: In the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th articles there is no difference." Melancthon "made no mention of the 18th Article of the Confession in the first draft of the Apology." "Moreover, the Confession (Art. 21) *boasts*"—we find no boasting in it—"that there is nothing in it (the Confession, not the 18th Article) which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Roman Church, in so far as is known from writers." This Dr. Richard, like a true sophist, applies only to the 18th Article, while the Confession applies it to its whole contents. If it makes the 18th Article to be understood in the Roman sense, then the whole Confession is to be understood in the Roman sense, *quod absurdum est*. This is truly sweeping. Dr. Richard again has proved it all. We all, including Dr. Richard, are Roman papists, 1) in regard to the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th articles; 2) in regard to the whole Augsburg Confession. Dr. Richard will have to resort and

subscribe to the Form of Concord if he wants to remain a Protestant.

But we have compassion for him and will help him to remain a Protestant and Lutheran by simply clinging to the Augsburg Confession. For the first we give him a *correct view of the whole Confession*, including Article 18, by translating from the German text the "boast" of the Church for her Confession in the 2d Article: "For inasmuch the same (Confession) be clearly founded on Holy Scripture and, furthermore, is not discrepant nor contrary to the Catholic Christian, yea, even the Roman Church, as can be learned from the writings of the Fathers, we hold that our opponents cannot be dissenting from us in the articles shown above." We think that the Latin text, which Dr. Richard has translated, does not teach anything else. From the history of the Augsburg Confession we remember that the princes at the Diet (June 25, 1530) said of the Latin copy that it "was put together in haste and bad to read," when Emperor Charles V insisted on its reading. We further remember that the confessors had to put in "differences" according to the imperial convocation of the Diet at Augsburg. Therefore the contention of the confessors cited above means that *they were* the true Catholic Church, and their opponents, where they disagreed, not in accord with the Church. They were true confessors who were neither "insincere," did not "equivocate," did not "hide their convictions," did not "mutilate and obscure their faith," but "did heroically witness and faithfully defend it, as far as this argument is concerned." On that horn of the proposed dilemma we stake ourselves.

As regards the 18th Article, for which the Committee reported agreement, because the Romanists did not object, Melanchthon *made* mention of it as soon as the Apology was to go into publicity, while it was unnecessary at the time when it was to be delivered to the Emperor. Should the confessors anger the Emperor yet more by objecting to him what his confutators had pleased to find correct? But Melanchthon stated



the difference completely to his co-confessors, when publishing the Apology, because Emperor Charles had refused it.

We translate a few sentences from the Apology to show how Melanchthon and the Church understood their confession and pointed out the differences. "Our opponents accept the 18th Article of free-will, though they quote a few sentences from Scripture which do (in the opinion of the opponents) not agree with it. They also make a great clamor (noise) thereof, that free-will should not be exalted as Pelagians do, and should not take therefrom too much with the Manicheans. That they may well say! For what difference is there between the Pelagians and our opponents, if they both teach that men can love God, keep the commandments *quoad substantiam actuum* (in so far as the substance of the acts is concerned), that is, do good works without the Holy Spirit by means of their natural reason to merit the grace of God? What numerous errors follow from this Pelagian teaching which they so strongly drive and preach in their schools! . . . We ALSO say that man's will has *some freedom*. For in things which may be comprehended by reason (*quas ratio per se comprehendit*) we have a free-will. There is in us, *in small measure*, a power of choice to lead outwardly an honorable life, to speak of God, to show outward worship or holy manners, to obey the government and parents, not to steal and murder. . . . This the Holy Scripture calls the *righteousnes of the Law or of the flesh* . . . though the inherited evil concupiscence is so powerful that men follow the same oftener than their reason. And the devil, who according to Paul works powerfully in the godless, provokes and entices the poor, weak nature to all sins. . . . BUT such hearts as are without the Holy Spirit are without fear of God, faith, and trust, believe not that God forgives sins and hears prayers. Therefore they are godless. . . . But *free-will and reason are powerless* (unable) to have true faith," etc.

We shield "Melanchthon's memory from falsehood, treason, and hypocrisy" by showing that he knew the difference between his co-confessors and the confutators, and confessed it

when he had to do it. Melancthon also distinctly states of the 9th and 10th articles, *without pointing out the difference* between the Roman and the Protestant interpretation, that the confutators did not object to them, and the 9th Article is mentioned by the confutators themselves as correct. Did he and his co-confessors for that reason endorse the Roman doctrines of the *opus operatum*, transubstantiation, etc.? We will remind Dr. Richard only of the York and Canton resolution of the General Synod of which he has been a stout defender (as far as we know).

Now in regard to the "Lutheran seven" members of the Committee of Reconciliation, August 18, 1530. Did "they equivocate, hide their convictions, mutilate and obscure their faith"? We say they *did* faithfully witness and heroically defend their faith, not only when they subscribed the Confession, but also when their opponents were in ascendancy. They defended it in Committee from Scripture, Church (even Roman) authorities, etc., so strongly, that the Romanists had to *let it pass*, because they could bring no true reason against it, for which the Apology is witness, declaring that they had made a great noise against it. They had to let it, like some other articles, pass and report agreement, and the confessors, we hold, were *not obliged to oppose them in that*. They were *glad to have carried that point*, which the Roman church most strongly defends, in which she has her being. Is this not a by far nobler vindication of their sincerity, conviction, and faithfulness than Dr. Richard's, that they interpreted it and wanted it interpreted by their opponents in the Roman sense by *not injecting* the "lapis — truncus — mere passive — subjectum patiens — subjectum convertendum theory of free-will," which was wholly unnecessary? On account of the lying Romanist endorsement the Augsburg Confession need *not* contain free-will.

Thus we have unbuttoned the historical argument, and we may take our dear Augsburg Confession and recommend it to all followers of the Lord as a sacred inheritance and faithful witness for the truth of God that *man has no free-will in divine*



*matlers* and for spiritual works without having received the Holy Spirit through the Word. But when men like Dr. Richard put it on as a subterfuge for saying that yet something of it is left, *we must be permitted to use much stronger language*: "Longe fuge: fenum habet in cornu!"

Carroll, Nebr.

FR. SCHWARZ.

## DR. MARTIN LUTHER'S TREATISE OF CONFESSION, WHETHER THE POPE HAVE POWER TO ENJOIN SAME.

### PART SECOND.

36. I. Here we ask the pope and all his followers whence they have authority to impose confession on all Christians, and where God has commanded it. Come forth, dear friends, show document and seal of your office and render account, as St. Peter has bidden you when he said [1 Pet. 3, 15]: "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." They adduce, first, the saying of Christ, Matt. 8, 4, when He purified the leper and said: "Go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." Here, they say, Christ has commanded us to show ourselves to the priest, that is, we are to confess our sins secretly to the priest. And although this is such a foolish gloss that it ought to be ridiculed rather than refuted, we will serve them and take their error from them. But they must not become angry because the sheep begin to teach the shepherd, the disciples the master, the subjects their superiors. The perverted state of affairs is their fault, for they are totally perverted and wrong. If a blind man regained his eyesight and his leader remained blind, I hope the leader would justly renounce his honor and mastership or be left as a senseless fool. Neither is this inversion a new thing. David (Ps. 119, 98—100) says: "Thou

through Thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies; for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers: for Thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep Thy precepts."

37. It is no wonder that the foolish who cling to God's Word become wise, and that the wise who cling to human laws become fools; therefore, the reason why we know more than the pope, bishops, cardinals, priests, and monks is this: they pass God's Word, the light of all creatures, by and crawl after the devil into human ordinances, and there is nothing but darkness. For this reason God says Hos. 4, 6 to the same perverse men: "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me." Thus it happens according to Ps. 18, 26: "With the froward" (Vulgate: *perverso*) "Thou wilt show Thyself froward" (Vulgate: *perverteris*).

38. II. But is it honest, to say nothing of Christianity, to build up so much misery on such an impious foundation? to impose such a tax, to cause so much terror, to practice such tyranny, such iniquity and violence? O pope, how do thy and thy followers' merits look! In the first place, you refuse to be coerced by a dark passage of Scripture, you demand that everything that is to constrain you be clear and expressed in non-figurative language, and even then you refuse to be bound by it. Why, then, do you urge us to confession with this verse which contains not a word of confession, not a word of sins, but merely says: the one purified is to show himself to the priest? Moreover, that same priest was a priest of Moses according to the old covenant and had no power to forgive sins. This power has been given solely to the new covenant together with the keys; the apostles might more properly have absolved him.

39. If you say he meant to signify confession, you must prove the signification. Another man might take it to signify something else. Figures of speech and interpretations prove

nothing, says St. Augustine. I, too, will give an interpretation that shall come nearer the point than yours, namely: There is no doubt that all figures and the entire law of Moses point to Christ, as St. Paul says Rom. 3, 21. 22. 25. Thus the priest signifies Christ, who alone is priest for us all. Now when we are purified by faith in Him, it is our duty to show ourselves to Him, that is, to confess that we in ourselves are altogether sinful, and just only by His grace. Behold, the thanks, praise, honor, and confession are signified by this allegory in which all men without exception are included: for they are all sinners before God and justified only through Christ. This is the true interpretation that emphasizes faith, not good works, Christ and not man.

40. III. So this verse has been done away with. In the second place, they bring forward the saying of Solomon, Prov. 27, 23: "Be thou diligent to know the state" (Vulgate: *vultum* = face) "of thy flocks." This they construe into a searching of the consciences that knows no end or rest; and thus they comment: *vultus* means conscience. Is that not wonderful Latin and German? *Vultus* means the heart and "to know" means to hear confession. But how, if some one would not confess or would not confess all, as it frequently happens, how will you know his *vultus*? You needs must know it if you are to satisfy the law.

41. It must be a queer God who would command things to you that are not in your power, but depend on the hidden will of another. Where has He given more such laws? Would it not be sensible, inasmuch as we have so boldly assumed the power to comment, if we inverted the verse as follows: "O flock, be thou diligent to let thy face be known," in order that the verse may aim no longer at us, but at the laity? Just as above the leper was bound to show himself, while the priest was not commanded to view all lepers, which would have been a difficult matter. Behold, on such flimsy foundations rests confession and all popery, and yet they refuse to let anyone know Scripture except themselves, thinking that their cause rests on



stronger pillars than the heavens. But they do this in order that no one may discover their coarse lies and deception. Falsehood cannot bear the light, therefore it desires to speak alone and brooks no contradiction.

42. IV. Neither are they cautious enough to consider that that confession is, as they themselves teach, a sacrament of the New Testament, that in the Old Testament there was no confession, and that Solomon himself neither did nor could confess, as no keys were given. Therefore let us hear the genuine interpretation of this verse. Solomon teaches here that each one is to take care of his worldly goods and be satisfied with them, taking heed not to have anything belonging to his neighbor, since life is short. Therefore each one is to be content and not to slave and hoard as if he would live here forever. We read as follows (Prov. 27, 23 sq.): "Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flocks, and look well to thy herds. For riches are not forever: and doth the crown endure to every generation? The hay appeareth and the tender grass showeth itself, and herbs of the mountains are gathered." (That is, do not worry, do not rob, be content; for grass and hay grows every day, the field is not covered, why should you worry?) "The lambs are for thy clothing, and the goats are the price of the field" (that is, sell them and with the money pay your wages, not in order to build great houses, but to till the field). "And thou shalt have goats' milk enough for thy food, for the food of thy household and for the maintenance for thy maidens" (that is, produce milk, butter, and cheese, eat of it, sell it, and thus procure your maintenance).

43. Behold, thus Solomon warns us against avarice and worry and teaches us how to enjoy in a godly manner temporal goods, and we have made a confession of it! But when he speaks of the *vultus* of the flock, he means its general form and appearance. For every man knows his flock from that of another by the appearance of his flock whether it is red, white, small, large, many, or few. Such external form the Hebrew language calls "*face*," as opposed to the heart, and says that

God sees and judges by the heart and not by outward appearance, as man sees and judges [1 Sam. 16, 7].

44. V. The third passage is that of James the apostle (James 5, 16), and reads as follows: "Confess your faults one to another and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." This brings us to the New Testament. And, indeed, confession and sin is here touched upon, for he says: "Confess your faults." But he assigns us a strange confessor, namely, *alter-utrum*; the pope and his adherents do not like him at all. *Alter-utrum* means one to the other, and means us all. Consequently, the confessors must confess to the laity, and they are not the only priests, bishops, and pope, but every Christian is pope, bishop, and priest, and the pope must confess to him. Before they admit that, they give up this verse and concede that it does not speak of secret confession. And that is the truth, although they at first adduced this passage.

45. For James means this: A man who has offended God, must accuse himself before Him and confess his sins, and they shall be forgiven him; as David says Ps. 32, 6: "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." Just so every one ought to humble himself before his neighbor, especially if he has offended him, and to confess his sin and not to excuse himself insolently. For this does not bring peace, but is a hindrance in prayer. This James would prevent by saying: "Pray one for another, that ye may be healed." [James 5, 16.] This you cannot do unless you forgive each other, as the Lord's Prayer teaches: "Forgive us as we forgive," etc. [Matt. 6, 12.] But you cannot forgive, unless one confesses his sins to the other where-with he has offended him. Thus each one must be willing to take the fault upon himself, so that by all means peace may be maintained and prayer not impeded. Thus Christ teaches us (Matt. 5, 23, 24) to reconcile ourselves to our neighbor before bringing the gift to the altar.

46. VI. The fourth and main passage is John 20, 22, 23, where Christ breathed on His disciples and says: "Receive ye

the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." The victory is won. Here they say: Why, if we are to remit sins, we must know them. But how can we know them unless they are told us? Here let us see what misery and sweat they bring upon themselves by this verse. If there is a verse in the Bible opposed to secret confession, it is this very one.

47. (First.) This verse says nothing of secret confession; moreover, it says nothing of public confession. And if it obliged us to confess in secret, it would oblige us to confess in public all our sins. For the pope might here just as well argue and say: If I am to remit, you must confess; but now I will not remit secretly, but publicly, and you must confess publicly. Thus our confessing would be tied fast to his remitting; and wherever he went with his remitting, our appended confession must follow. This would give him the power to reveal the secrets of all hearts, as if he were God Himself, who has reserved unto Himself to know the secrets of the hearts. But if this verse does not demand public confession, neither does it demand secret confession. Therefore it is not true that in this verse they are given authority to demand and dogmatize confession, and confession is not tied to their remission, but the contrary is true.

48. Remission is tied to confession, and remission must follow and be guided by confession. If I desire to confess secretly, you are bound to remit secretly. If I desire to confess publicly, you are bound to remit publicly. My confession is not arbitrary with you, but with me. Moreover, absolution is my privilege, not yours. I have the right and the liberty to demand it; you have no right to deny it, but are bound and forced to grant it. Thus Christ has made servants of His officers; while you invert the thing and wish to make me a servant, retaining for yourself the right and authority over my confession and absolution. Behold, this is all wrong.

49. VII. Consider if the following is not the meaning of the text. It does not say: Come and confess and go your



way, as a command to confess their sins, but: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." The words contend for no more than that you are bound to remit sins to all that desire it, and you are a servant set for this purpose. But the confessant is left free and is promised absolution, so that he may use it when and how and where he chooses. If he is not willing, you are not to urge him, for no man can give or ought to give to any one without his thank and willingness. But absolution is a great gift of God. In the same manner we cannot and ought not to force anyone to believe, but can only present the Gospel earnestly and admonish every one to believe it, allowing him to choose freely whether to accept it or not. All sacraments must be free to everyone. Whosoever will not be baptized, let him go without it. Whosoever will not receive the sacrament (communion) is well within his rights. Similarly, whosoever will not confess has the right before God to refuse. Thus, you see they have forced this text to make confession compulsory, when this very text makes it free. On the other hand, they have made remission of sins free and arbitrary to themselves, when this very passage compels them to absolve. What misery must not ensue from such impious perversion of the Scripture of God, when all the world is mocked and deceived with lies and the vain fancies of men.

50. VIII. (Secondly.) But is it not a shame that such a burden has been imposed upon all mankind, although not a single clear passage can be brought forward in support of all this ado? They must make shift with such forced glosses and flimsy pretenses in such a lousy and beggarly manner, although Christ has so often and so clearly explained Baptism and Holy Communion and all things which He requires of us. And this matter of secret confession, almost the greatest thing in Christendom, is not to have a single clear text? And what shall we do for the holy fathers in the desert who do not confess, do not receive the sacrament, and know nothing of the law of the pope?

51. Moreover, in Ambrosius, Augustine, Jerome, and their compeers among the fathers nothing is found written on

this subject; which would be a strange thing considering that they have written so abundantly on all other topics of Christian religion. Someone has written a book under the name of St. Augustine *De Vera et Falsa Poenitentia*, which is confidently adduced in canonical law and sentences, though it belongs less to St. Augustine than to me and you. In one place he even introduced Augustine by name, and he was such a grossly ignorant fellow that he does not hesitate to propose the saying of Christ [Matt. 10, 32]: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven" as a reason for secret confession, and much more of the same kind. Well, it is a book for the pope and the papists, who are worth nothing better. An ass must not eat figs, but thistles. But it has done much harm and greatly strengthened confession, so that I fear its author lies in the lowest depth of hell, unless he repented earnestly.

52. IX. (Thirdly.) Moreover, they contradict each other. They say: If I am to remit or retain sins, I must know them. Those that I do not know I can neither remit nor retain, therefore we must have confession. Here I ask, What does the pope mean when he proclaims in his bulls by his apostles that he remits all sins, pain, and guilt by name, forgotten and unconscious sins, and leads the soul instantaneously<sup>1)</sup> to heaven out of hell, out of purgatory and out of all misfortune; and he cannot err as he says. One of you must lie and deceive; the pope or you. If unconscious and forgotten sins can be remitted, then there is no urgent proof in what you say: I cannot remit sins, unless I know them, and you have lost this text and confession.

53. But if your theory holds good, then the pope mocks and deceives the whole world with his remission and his leading to heaven. What will you say now? Behold, this is the result of making a dogma of human trash, and then trying to

---

1) *von Mund auf*, that is, as soon as he opens his mouth. See Grimm, *Woerterbuch*, art. Mund, sub 12.

strengthen it by divine Scripture. You cannot braid a beard of straw for Scripture. It quickly puts to shame all those who attempt to defile and pollute it, as the wise man says. Therefore I conclude in regard to both of you: You lie and the pope deceives, and neither of you is a safe guide. You enforce confession with false glosses, and the pope cannot remit unconscious and forgotten sins, and the truth remains and passes between you both, namely: you need know and remit only those sins that are confessed to you. Those that are not confessed to you, you need neither know nor remit.

54. X. (Fourthly.) Therefore it is not only wrong, but also a very foolish assertion when they say: Sins cannot be remitted unless they are made known to them. For this would be driving us to do an impossible thing, inasmuch as no man can know all his sins. The larger portion is reserved for God, and only of the smaller number do we become conscious, as the 19th Psalm, v. 13, says: "Who can understand his errors?" And Ps. 40, 13: "For innumerable evils have compassed me about: mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head: therefore my heart faileth me."

55. But if you say: We must confess those that we know after diligent introspection, I ask: How will you prove that? And where will you place the limit in order that so many simple men may know how far they must search themselves, and what sins they must confess or not confess? Who shall tell to everyone what is a venial and what a mortal sin when no doctor, no father, no saint has ever found or known or taught it? And you undertake to drive the whole multitude of the world into such uncertain labor that they never know how they stand. Do you think that Christ's Word teaches the hearts thus to sway like reeds and veer like the winds? Christ claims to be, and is called, a firm rock [Matt. 16, 18; 1 Cor. 10, 4], so that in His Word everyone may know how he stands, not swaying hither and thither as the billows on the sea that know no rest.



56. XI. But some one might say: Granted that remitting sins is not arbitrary with the priest, but that he is bound to remit whenever he is requested: what have you to say in regard to the retaining of sins? That, surely, does not rest with the sinner; he may consent or not, the priest may retain his sins and excommunicate him. I answer: I have said before that all words of retention and remission of sins in the Gospel apply no farther than to public excommunication and absolution, now called the ban. As Christ Himself, Matt. 18, 15—18, applies excommunication and absolution to such sinners as were first admonished privately, then rebuked in the presence of witnesses, and lastly accused and convicted before the multitude and congregation. This wholesome custom has been entirely lost through the fault of our tyrants and deceivers, pope and bishops with their scourgers and executioners, the officials. In these public sins it is true that the congregation or the minister, as representative of the congregation, has authority to bind the sinner even against his will, and must absolve him when he desires it. But from this it does not follow that they may search out the sin, as they wish to do. On the contrary, it follows that here also the public sin must first be exposed and known to all.

57. XII. But on the score of secret sins no one can be admonished or rebuked privately, let alone being accused and convicted publicly. Therefore there is no authority in the church to remit or retain them, but each one is free to choose whether he will admonish, rebuke, and accuse himself and confess. There is a great difference between confessing sins, and retaining or remitting sins. Christ's words deal neither with denying nor confessing, but with the retention and remission of sins that are publicly denied or confessed. Now, in order to create trouble for themselves, they would interpret confession as meaning retention. In this fashion they might urge us and reason us into committing sins, in order that they have something to retain and remit. For the reasoning is just as valid, if I argue thus: If I am to retain and remit, there

must be sin; how else can I remit or retain? Just as they regard it as good reasoning to say: If I am to retain or remit, the sin must be confessed. Consequently, as we cannot reason thus: You must retain or remit; therefore men ought to commit sin, so we cannot reason thus: You must retain or remit; therefore men ought to confess. But, contrariwise, this is valid reasoning: If anyone has committed a sin, you may retain or remit it unto him. Similarly: If anyone has confessed and revealed his sin, you may retain or remit it unto him. This is the purport of Christ's words, and nothing more.

58. XIII. My only contention is this, that confession is not to be demanded, but to be accepted. The keys must deal with sins and not with the heart and conscience; they are not to lock or unlock hearts and consciences, but heaven. They are not called keys of hearts or keys of consciences, but keys of heaven.

59. Christ did not say to Peter: I will give thee the keys of the hearts or consciences; those keys He has retained for Himself till the day of judgment as St. Paul says, Rom. 2, 16 and 1 Cor. 4, 5. But thus He says: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. And John 20 He says not: Whosoever heart ye unlock shall be unlocked; whosoever heart ye lock shall be locked, but: "Whosoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained," etc. Let sins come before you, bind or loose; you are not called upon to seek them or wrest them from men. A secular judge is also in duty bound to punish the wicked and to free the just; but that does not oblige him to know or search out all secret misdoings, but only that which comes to his notice.

60. XIV. And what need is there of so many words? If loosening and binding is so completely in their power that no sin can be forgiven without their absolution, what becomes of those they bind unjustly, who before God are surely loosed?

61. On the other hand, what does it avail those whose sins they do not and will not bind, or if they publicly remit sins which before God are retained? Therefore, does this text of

John necessarily prove that everything is loosed that they loose, and bound what they bind, as the pope and the bishops have so often presumptuously affirmed? They drivel, that whatsoever they bind is bound; and whatsoever they loose is loosed, though admitting that they often loose that which is not loose, and bind what is not bound. Hence we will rest content with this, that there are two ways of making sins known: one, by a public conviction through witnesses before the congregation, which Christ teaches Matt. 18, 15—18; this is necessary and sufficient for the keys and for ecclesiastical authority; the second comes about voluntarily and freely, without accusation and compulsion; this is the best and entirely salutary. Therefore, without being urged or compelled, it must be left to each man's free choice, and cannot be confined by human laws.

62. XV. Consequently, one must not condemn those that confess their secret sins to God alone, or to His saints, or to whomsoever they wish, and not to the priest, provided they do this in true repentance, honesty, and faith. Neither ought we to be disturbed by the terrible examples which some preachers of dreams have concocted concerning the damnation of those who had not confessed. Their purpose is to frighten the people and to drive them into their money-net. St. Paul has foretold all this, that the Antichrist would deceive the world with false signs and miracles with the help of the devil, so that now it is highly necessary to judge not according to signs, but according to the clear Scriptures of God. Abraham, Luke 16, would not grant the rich man that Lazarus, or one from the dead, be sent to his brethren, but referred them to Scripture and said [Luke 16, 29]: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." And in all Scripture not much is said about revelations made by the dead, as these examples pretend. You may be convinced that if they had to give as much in confession as they take from it, they would, so far from urging you, drive you away by force.

63. XVI. But now we come to the most serious point. Before Christ gave command to remit and retain sins, He



breathed upon them and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," John 20, 22, 23. Here the truth is established, that no one can forgive sins except he have the Holy Ghost. For the words lie plainly before us and yield not. It avails nothing to babble that this is an article of John Huss or Wycliffe and was condemned at Constance. It is not enough to condemn; we must have an answer. And it is not sufficient to point out to us that Matt. 23, 3 we read: "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works." For that is said of preaching, an office for which Christ sent His apostles. He did not breathe upon them and did not yet give them the Holy Ghost, as He does here.

64. Now what has become of the keys of the pope? I think they must slip from his hands without his consent, and it must be seen that he most impiously wears them alone in his escutcheon; for here we clearly read that no one has the keys, except he have the Holy Ghost. Hence one ought to paint upon the pope's escutcheon—I know what—and expunge the keys. That escutcheon belongs to some one else than the pope. But on the other hand: If I am not to have remission of my sins, except the confessor have the Holy Ghost,—and no one can know this assuredly of another whether he have the Holy Ghost,—when would I become assured of my absolution and gain a quiet conscience? Things would remain as before.

65. XVII. My answer is this: I have brought up this point in order that people may see the real foundation of this thing. There is no doubt that sins are not retained or remitted except by him alone that has the Holy Ghost so surely that you and I may know it, as the words of Christ here prove. But this is no one else than the Christian Church, that is, the communion of all believers in Christ; it alone has these keys; of that there can be no doubt. And whosoever appropriates these keys for himself is a genuine unscrupulous *sacrilegus*, despoiler of churches, whether it be the pope or someone else. Of this church all men are sure that it have the Holy Ghost,

as St. Paul, following Christ, and all Scriptures abundantly prove, and as it is very briefly expressed in the Creed, where we say: I believe in the existence of a holy Christian Church. It is holy on account of the Holy Ghost, whom it surely has. Hence no man ought to accept the absolution of the pope or bishop, as if *they* were the ones who absolve. God defend us from the absolution of the pope and bishops of which the world is now full! It is the absolution of the devil.

66. But you must do as Christ says Matt. 10, 41: "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward." Hence if a stone or a piece of wood could absolve me in the name of the Christian Church, I would accept it. On the other hand, if the pope were to place me into the highest choir of angels in the name of his authority, I would stop up both my ears and regard him as the greatest blasphemer. He is a servant of the keys as all other priests, and the keys belong to the Church alone. A master can allow his servant to have his coat of arms, as long as he does not claim the coat of arms to be his before the other servants and other people. Thus the Church gives the keys to the pope, and commands him to have and to use them in its name; but it does not concede them to be his property.

67. XVIII. Therefore our Creed observes this order: the article forgiveness of sins must follow the article "a holy Christian Church," and this in its turn must be preceded by: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." So that it may be known that without the Holy Ghost there is no Christian Church, and without the holy Church no forgiveness of sins. Hence it is not true that the pope have the keys. The Church alone has them, and not he; the Church alone retains and remits, and he and all priests are servants in this. From this it follows that the pope in his office is to be a servant of all servants, as he boastfully styles himself without acting up to it, so that a child in its cradle and all that have the Holy Ghost have a

better claim to the keys than he. Let this be sufficient in regard to this text.

68. Thus we have found that the pope has no authority at all to make a dogma of secret confession and to require it, and his reasons have been found false and dishonest, as St. Peter has said of him and his followers, 2 Pet. 2, 1. 3: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you who with feigned words shall make merchandise of you" (LUTHER: "shall deprive you of your money"). What are "feigned words" other than such unsound, worthless reasons of popish tyranny, wherewith he harms all men, deprives the world of its money, and leads all souls that follow him to the devil? It remains for us to explain (and you shall now hear) what *we* think of this text and of secret confession.

Fort Wayne, Ind.

W. H. KRUSE.

(To be concluded.)

## THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.<sup>1)</sup>

(Continued.)

John 20, 17: *I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.*

In that touching discourse with Mary Magdalene after His resurrection, Christ says among other things: "I ascend unto *my Father*, and *your Father*." The term *Father* is here applied to the first person of the Trinity, and He is said to be the Father of Christ and the Father of Christ's disciples, the true Christians. But let us observe the peculiar wording of the text. The Lord does not say: "I ascend unto *our Father*," but, "I ascend unto *my Father* and *your Father*," indicating that though we have with Christ the same Father, yet not in

1) With the present issue Prof. Wessel relieves the editor in expounding the proof texts. Regular contributions by the same author may be expected on this subject. — ED.



the same sense. *Christ stands in a peculiar and unique relation to the Father.* God is the Father of Christ on account of the essential, most singular, and inexplicable eternal generation of the Son. Ps. 2, 7: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee." (Cf. THEOL. QUART., vol. X, p. 167.) Christ is "the Only-Begotten of the Father," John 1, 14. 18; He is the essential and co-equal Son of God, being "one with the Father," John 10, 30. "He is the Son of God, not *χάριτι*, or by grace, but *φύσει*, or by nature, John 1, 14. 18." (Quenstedt.)

The "brethren," however, to whom this message is to be communicated (cf. John 20, 17: "Go unto my *brethren*, and say to them"), the disciples of Christ, the true Christians, are through Him the adopted children of God, *χάριτι*, by grace. John 1, 12: "But as many as received Him, to them *gave* He the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." His disciples He taught to pray: "Our *Father*, which art in heaven."

In short, Christ born out of the essence of the Father is very God of very God; the believers, begotten "with the word of truth," James 1, 18, "born of incorruptible seed, by the Word of God," 1 Pet. 1, 23, "born of God," John 1, 13, remain men, creatures of God.

The subtile discrimination made in the text between "*my* Father and *your* Father," etc., has been observed and commented on ever since the days of the church-fathers. Augustine's terse explanation may find a place here: „Non ait, Patrem nostrum; aliter ergo meum, aliter vestrum; *natura* meum, *gratia* vestrum. Et, Deum meum et Deum vestrum. Neque hic dixit Deum nostrum; ergo et hic aliter meum, aliter vestrum. Deum meum, sub quo et Ego sum homo: Deum vestrum, inter quos et Ipsum Mediator sum." (Tract. CXXI.) "He does not say: '*Our* Father;' therefore in one sense mine, in another, yours; mine by *nature*, yours by *grace*. And, He says, '*my* God and *your* God.' Here, too, He has not said, '*our* God;' therefore also here in one sense mine, in another yours.

*My* God, under whom also I am as a man; *your* God, whom I reconciled to you as the Mediator between you and Him."

Mal. 2, 10: *Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?*

In a certain sense God is the Father of all mankind. "Have we not all one *Father?*" This rhetorical question demands an answer in the affirmative. The reason for this implied assertion is given in the second interrogation which is in the nature of an explanation to the former. "Hath not one God *created us?*" Inasmuch as God *created* all mankind, He is said to be the *Father* of all.

But this universal fatherhood of God over all creatures must not be confounded with the special fatherhood over His children adopted unto Himself through Jesus Christ. As Christians we have become God's children in a sense in which not all men are His children.

If there be no other connection between God and man than the fact that God created him, this fatherhood will avail him nothing. Man, by sin, has lost the first estate into which he was created. Sin has separated him and his God. The Prodigal Son, who had wasted his substance in riotous living, full well knew that he was not worthy to be called his father's son. He was a *lost* son, until he returned penitently. Cf. Luke 15, 11 sqq. The relation in which man by nature stands to God is that in which a violator of the law, convicted of, and condemned for, his crime, stands before his sovereign. He is the object of divine displeasure. "The wrath of God abideth on him," John 3, 36. The condemnation that Christ hurls at the Jews who did not believe on Him, applies to all unbelievers: "Ye are of your *father*, the *devil*, and the lusts of your father you will do," John 8, 44. Again, in the language of Scripture: "They have corrupted themselves; their spot is not the spot of children: they are a perverse and crooked generation," Deut. 32, 5. The wicked are not spiritual children of God, but rather "children of the wicked one," Matt. 13, 38.

Who, then, are the only true children of God? Paul answers: "Ye are all the *children* of God *by faith in Christ Jesus*," Gal. 3, 26.

This distinction between the universal and the special fatherhood of God must be plainly kept in view, in order to guard against that rationalistic conception of the "all-fatherhood of God," according to which God is supposed to be a gracious God without Christ, a conception about which the lodges prate so loudly in order to mislead the unwary, and which finds expression in that meaningless jingle of phrases: "The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

Eph. 3, 14, 15: *For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.*

In these opening words of the supplication of the Apostle Paul for the congregation at Ephesus, the first person of the Trinity is spoken of as the Father in reference to His dear Son, Jesus Christ. Why He is so termed has been sufficiently expounded in a preceding passage. But God is also called Father on account of the *family* that is named of Him. This latter fact we shall endeavor to elucidate.

The phrase: "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named," reads in the original: ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται. The point made by the apostle in these words is somewhat obscured by the English translation. In Greek there is a play upon the words πατήρ (Father) and πατριὰ (family) which cannot be reproduced in English. The Greek word πατριὰ (family) is etymologically derived from πατήρ (Father). "The relation of names expresses here a relation of facts. God is the true Father to every family, loving it and caring for it." (Voigt.) The word for *family* (πατριὰ) designates a lineage, the descendants of a common father; so a πατριὰ is a generation of children. Thus Joseph, Luke 2, 4, is described as "being of the household and *family* (πατριὰ) of David." — "*From whom*," ἐξ οὗ, obviously refers to the "*Father* (πατέρα) of our Lord Jesus Christ." Every πατριὰ,



says the text, receives its name from the *πατήρ* (Father). It is so named because it stands in close relation to the Father. The term *Father* connotes the notion *child*. A person is called a *father* because he has a child or children. Now, who are they that stand in child-relation to this heavenly Father? Who are they of whom God says: These people belong to my family, they are my children? "Ye are all the *children* of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus," Gal. 3, 26. So, then, "*every family*" does not comprise all mankind, but only the community of God's own. This explanation is in keeping with the context and is favored by the tenor of the whole epistle. (Cf. chap. 1, 9. 10.)

From the foregoing it is already patent what the endearing appellation is that the Father has bestowed upon those constituting His family. In holy wonderment over the ineffable grace of God in Christ Jesus, St. John exclaims: "Behold, what manner of love the *Father* hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the *sons*" — τέκνα, the *children* — "of God," 1 John 3, 1. Only they who have received the adoption of sons can cry: "Abba, Father!" (Cf. Gal. 4, 6.)

The name *Father* calls to mind all the abundant mercy God has showered upon us through His dear Son, in whom He has adopted us as His children; the name "*child of God*" contains the unspeakable blessedness of a sinner saved. "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ," Rom. 8, 16.

Now, God has a family *in heaven*. The text says: *πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς* — every family in heaven. This expression does not only comprise the perfected saints, but primarily the "sons of God," Job 38, 4. 7, the holy angels, divided amongst themselves into various orders, such as thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, Col. 1, 16, cherubim and seraphim, Is. 6, 2. — The Father has a family *on earth*: His children collected from among all nations, kindreds, and tongues. Both the children in heaven and those on earth constitute one great family, the *ecclesia una sancta* in a wider sense.

Luther's free translation: "Der der rechte Vater ist ueber alles, was da Kinder heisst im Himmel und auf Erden," is at the same time a beautiful commentary of the text.

Gen. 1, 1: *In the beginning God created heaven and earth.*

This statement, so simple yet so sublime on account of its very simplicity, brands all the nebulous theories regarding the creation of the world of so-called scientists as falsehoods and lies.

"In the beginning *God* created heaven and earth." Incontrovertibly, then, God already existed *in* the beginning, aye, *before* the beginning of things. Besides Him there was nothing that had existence. It was He alone that inhabited eternity. "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou *art* God," Ps. 90, 2.

"*In the beginning* God created heaven and earth." The phrase, "In the beginning," precludes the evolutionistic notion of the eternity of matter. This world of ours had a beginning. "Of old hast Thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of Thy hands," Ps. 102, 25. In the light of these majestic dicta of Scripture, how absurd, nonsensical, and puerile are the vague mouthings of the evolutionists! Millions of ages ago, say they, the illimitable space was filled with nebulous matter. This indefinable something "gradually cooling and contracting, threw off, in obedience to mechanical and physical laws, successive rings of matter, from which subsequently, by the same laws, were produced the several planets, satellites, and other bodies of the solar system." Whence did this nebulous matter come? Who established these mechanical and physical laws? How did they work?—all of which questions we should not have the temerity to ask. It must suffice that Science has spoken. Thus God is done away with. "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." A scientist of this stripe is a *fool*.

"In the beginning God created *heaven and earth*." That was the actual beginning of this world's history, the beginning

of all things, the beginning of time. Heaven and earth were *created*. They did not arise by a process of emanation, nor were they evolved from any pre-existent primeval material. The statement simply reads: God *created* heaven and earth in the beginning. That says, when as yet there was no material existence, God brought this world into being by His almighty creative power. "He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast," Ps. 33, 9.

From the foregoing explanation the meaning of *create* becomes patent. Prior to the *beginning* of which the text speaks God only was in existence, nothing else besides Him. God called into being this universe. How? Out of nothing. Hence to *create* means *to make out of nothing*. The word בָּרָא, *to create*, occurs about fifty times in the Old Testament and is always used in reference to God. God only can create. Everywhere it signifies a divine production, a bringing into being by God's almighty power that which had no existence before. In a few instances where בָּרָא is used, a material is not absolutely excluded, as for example in Gen. 1, 27, but the primary and proper signification of the term is *to produce something out of nothing*, as is evident from the passage under consideration, where the idea of pre-existent material is simply absurd. The making of heaven and earth is *a creation out of nothing*. By His creative word God called the things that were not into existence, τὰ μὴ ὄντα: ὡς ὄντα, Rom. 4, 17. "Things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," Hebr. 11, 3. (See Is. 42, 5; 40, 26, etc.) —

בָּרָא (bara) is also applied to the almighty work of Renovation. When David prays: "*Create* in me a clean heart," Ps. 51, 12, he thereby confesses his utter inability to make his heart clean. To do so is not within the power of man; it, too, is a work of divine omnipotence. This David knew from the Word of God; this he had learned by sad experience.

The Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew *bara* is *κτίζω* (create), as is evident, *e. g.*, from Col. 1, 16: "By Him were all things *created*" (ἐκτίσθη). Rom. 1, 25: "They wor-



shipped and served the *creature* (τῇ κτίσει) more than Him who *created* it" (τὸν κτίσαντα). Eph. 3, 9: "God who *created* all things (τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι) by Jesus Christ." Instances might be multiplied. The term is not only used in reference to the creation of the world, but also in regard to the new-creation in Christ. Conversion of man is, according to Scripture, a new-creation. Eph. 2, 10: "We are His workmanship, *created* (κτισθέντες) in Christ Jesus." Man, by nature, is *dead* in trespasses and sin. To bring this dead man to life spiritually is as great a miracle as to raise a dead man from the grave; it is a work requiring the same almighty creative power that produced this visible world. Conversion, too, is a *creatio ex nihilo* by the word of God. — In short, the true and original meaning of *create* in the Old and New Testaments is *to produce out of nothing by the mere power of His word*. It is a prerogative of the almighty God.

From this very first passage of the Bible we learn how vain are the imaginings of those self-styled scientists who endeavor to substitute a vapory theory of evolution for the doctrine of creation; we observe furthermore how flatly Scripture denies atheism, polytheism, pantheism, and all other cognate "isms."

On the other hand, this passage affords great consolation for the Christians. This God, who has created heaven and earth, is our dear Father in Christ Jesus. He, the Almighty, can keep us in every need. With Him all things are possible. In all confidence we can trust in His divine guidance, saying with the psalmist: "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth," Ps. 121, 1. 2. And again: "Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth," Ps. 124, 8.<sup>2)</sup>

---

2) It may not be amiss to call attention to the fact that the words "God created" in the original text read: בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים (bara Elohim), thus joining a verb in the singular number (bara) with a plural noun (Elohim).

Hebr. 11, 3: *Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.*

In the preceding passage the *fact* of God's having created heaven and earth was stated; in this we are informed of the *manner* in which He performed the work. "The worlds were framed *λόγῳ* θεοῦ, *by the word of God.*" God said, "Let there be light!" and there was light. Through this almighty fiat of God things that did not exist before came into being. "He spake, and it was done," Ps. 33, 9. This assertion is enforced by what follows. The "things which are seen," τὰ βλεπόμενα, "the worlds," τοὺς αἰῶνας, all that exists in time, have not their being from things which appear in outward manifestation, μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων. This says emphatically that there was no material present out of which the "things seen" could have been made; there were no earthly germs, substances, or cells pre-existent from which by the power of nature the world could have evolved. This latter clause says as plainly as language can put it that the creation of the world was a *creatio ex nihilo*, and thus it substantiates the former, which declares that the worlds sprang into existence by the omnipotent *word* of God. Luther's translation, "dass alles, was man siehet, aus nichts worden ist," though not literal, hits the nail on the head.

The doctrine of the creation of the world is an article of faith. "*Through faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the *word* of God." But does not Rom. 1, 18—20 say that natural man can know of the existence of God by virtue of his reason, that he can know by the things that are made that there is a Creator? Is there a contradiction between these two passages? By no means. When contemplating nature the light of reason tells us that of itself, by accident, this world could not come into being. It must have had a rational, super-

---

This plural form of the noun indicates plurality *in* God, but not a plurality of Gods. The verb in the singular indicates that the Creator of heaven and earth is *one* God.

natural, wise, divine author. Further than this, however, reason cannot argue. *How* this universe was made reason cannot fathom. That it was made by the *word* of God reason cannot know. Reason says: *Ex nihilo nihil fit!* There must have been a matter from which the world was made. Therefore the text says: "*Through faith* we understand that the worlds were framed *by the word of God.*" Through what faith do we understand this? Through faith in the Word of God as it is recorded in Gen. 1, Ps. 104, and other passages which treat of this matter. This word is God's word, therefore true. This we believe, upon this we rely, and are thus divinely certain as to how this world was created, all the vain babblings of science falsely so-called to the contrary notwithstanding. Scientists are fallible men; God, who speaks in the Scriptures, is infallible. He, the Creator, knows more about His handiwork than all the geologists and germ theorists put in a heap. Where the statements of scientists and those of the Bible clash, the Bible must prevail, because it is the absolute truth from Genesis to Revelation.

Ps. 115, 3: *Our God is in the heavens: He hath done whatsoever He hath pleased.*

This passage is a mighty weapon in the hands of the believers, with which to put to flight all reproaches of unbelievers, scoffers, and blind reason. When questions are asked such as these: "How is it possible? How can these things be?" we answer in the words of Scripture recorded above. The text points out the omnipotence and sovereign majesty of God. "Our God is *in the heavens:*" that is the seat of His power and glory. He is not a man-made, impotent idol (cf. context), but the *almighty* God: "He hath done whatsoever He hath pleased."

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(*To be continued.*)

---

JOHN WICLIF.<sup>1)</sup>

AUTHORITIES: — Lorimer's *Lechler's Wiclif*; Buddensieg's *Wiclif*; Buddensieg's *Johann Wiclif u. s. Zeit*; Sergeant's *Wiclif*; Holt's *Wiclif*; Matthew's *Wiclif*; Loserth's *Wiclif and Hus*; Poole's *Wiclif and Movements for Reform*; Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wiclif*; Capes' *English Church in the 14th Century*; Brougham's *Wiclif in Old England's Worthies*; Green's *History of the English People*; Burrow's *Wiclif's Place in History*; Tulloch's *Leaders of the Reformation*; Sample's *Beacon Lights of the Reformation*; Lord's *Beacon Lights of History*; Storrs' *Oration on Wiclif*; *Dictionary of National Biography*; Wiclif's Bible, ed. Forshall and Madden; Pattison's *History of the English Bible*; Smyth's *How We Got Our Bible*; *British Quarterly Review*, October, 1858; *The Academy*, June 28, 1884; *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1902; *English Historical Review*, 1900; *International Cyclopedia*; *Encyclopedia Americana*; Patrick's *Lutterworth* and Lach-Szyrma's *Wiclif in the Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 1901; Shirley's *Catalogue of the Original Works of Wiclif*; Thompson's *Wiclif Exhibition in the British Museum*; Leeds' *Wiclif's Anti-War Views*; Wilson's *Wiclif*; Bishop Hurst's *Church History*.

## I. THE SCHOLAR.

John Wiclif was born between 1320 and 1330 in the parish of Wycliffe on the river Tees near Richmond in Yorkshire, England, in the beautiful country made famous by Sir Walter Scott in his *Rokeby*.

He sprang from an old and honored family of the lower nobility, and it is possible that he was the legal lord of the manor of Wycliffe and patron of the rectory. He came of Saxon stock which retained many of the German traits; to this very day the people of Yorkshire "speak an ancient dialect, which bears an unmistakable German impress." As late as 1884 Wiclif's Testament was read to an old lady there, and she understood every word, saying everybody spoke that way when she was a young girl, "before folk got so fine."

Egglestone Abbey, not far away, was then in a flourishing state, and likely the lad went to school there. Later he went to

---

1) There are about sixty ways of spelling the name; this form was adopted by the writer, 1. because it is the simplest; 2. because the best biographers of Germany and England use it; 3. because in the first public and in the first official documents this form is found.



Oxford and likely entered Balliol College, founded by the Balliols of Barnard Castle, not far from Wiclif's home.

Coming from the North, he joined the "Nation" of the "Boreales," a student society upholding Saxondom over against the Normans, the rights of the people over against the king, the rights of England over against the Pope, Realism over against Nominalism: in everything opposed to the "Austres" of Merton College.

For four years he studied the "Trivium" — Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic, and became a Bachelor of Arts; for three more years he studied the "Quadrivium" — Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy, and became a Master of Arts. Having served seven years for the Leah of the seven liberal arts, he served seven more years for the Rachel of theology and became a Bachelor of Theology and lectured on the Sentences of Peter of Novara the Lombard; after three more years of the study of the Latin Bible he became a Licentiate and lectured on one of the canonical books.

Aside from his regular studies he read in Optics, Acoustics, Physics, Chemistry, Roman Civil Law, Papal Canon Law, the old Saxon Law, and English History. He was a student of the writings of Augustine, Jerome, Aristotle, and made large use of the sermons of Chrysostom. From Thomas Bradwardine, the Doctor Profundus, he drew his doctrine of grace and predestination; from Fitz Ralph Armachanus he learned his views of Dominion; from William of Occam he derived his doctrine of the Lord's Supper; from Robert Grosseteste of Lincoln he found how to attack pluralities and the abuse of papal power; from Marsiglio of Padua, "of damned memory," he learned to demand that the Church be confined to her spiritual province, as Dante had done fifty years before, and to attack "the Caesarean clergy" and "the imperialized church," as Wiclif calls them. In addition to all this he held his idea of man's direct relation to God.

Wiclif never learned Greek, but he was a close student of the Latin Bible.

About 1360 the Fellows honored Wiclif by electing him Master of Balliol, and on May 16, 1361, his college presented him with the living of Fyllingham in Lincolnshire, about ten miles from London, worth thirty marks a year. He resigned his position as the head of the College and became a country parson, but much of his time was spent at the University, a vicar doing the parish work. From 1363 to 1365 he was at Oxford, living in rented rooms in the new Queen's College; in 1368 he got leave from his bishop to study at Oxford for two years. About 1366 (?) he received the crown of academic honors, the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and he was known as the "Doctor Evangelicus," the Gospel Doctor, as Luther loved to call himself a Doctor of the Scripture.

In order to train good men to reform the abuses in the Church, Archbishop Simon Islip, in 1361, founded Canterbury Hall for twelve students, and after removing the first Warden, Woodhall, made Wiclif the head on December 9, 1365, and in the following words: "Simon Islip to his dear son, Master John de Wycliffe: Having regard to your praiseworthy life, honorable conversation, and the literary acquirement in arts, and being assured of your truth, prudence, and carefulness, we commit to you the Wardenship."

On March 31, 1367, the new Archbishop Langham, himself a monk, ousted Wiclif and filled Canterbury Hall with monks from Christ Church, and thus overturned the will of the founder.

With splendid courage Wiclif protested against the crying injustice to the founder of Canterbury Hall, and he appealed to the Pope against the powerful head of the English Church. Archbishop Langham, now Cardinal, went to Rome, and as a monk got the monk Urban V to side with the monks against Wiclif and the dead Archbishop Islip. For a heavy bribe of 200 marks the King, in 1372, sustained the Pope, and the whole scandalous proceedings filled Wiclif with great indignation. Canterbury Hall was later merged with Cardinal Wol-

sey's Christ Church College, the most magnificent and wealthy of all colleges at Oxford.

In order to be nearer his beloved University, Wiclif, in November, 1368, resigned Fyllingham and became rector of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire, twenty miles from Oxford, although it gave him a smaller income.

About 1365 the country parson was made "a peculiar cleric of the king," likely a Royal Chaplain, and he gained influence at court. He also preached in the London pulpits and made a deep impression on the nobles and on the citizens.

On April 7, 1374, the crown gave to Wiclif the parish of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, seven miles from Rugby. The place was a small market town on a gentle rise in a flat district of rich pasture land. It boasted of a petrifying spring, a cage for evildoers, a cucking-stool for scolds, and a parish cat-o'-nine-tails. During this period Wiclif wrote his works on philosophy and logic, he preached often before the University, and engaged in many academic disputations. As a Bachelor of Divinity he lectured on Biblical Theology, as Master of Balliol on Philosophy, as Warden of Canterbury Hall on Scholastic Divinity.

Owing to the disastrous wars of France, the leading place once held by the University of Paris passed to Oxford, and in the golden age of Oxford Wiclif was the shining light, the "Flower of Oxford scholarship," and Oxford basked in the glory of the latest and greatest of her sons, and his fame spread far and wide, and students from all parts of Great Britain and even from the continent flocked to Oxford. Before the Plague there came as many as 30,000 students "to learn bad Latin and worse Logic," as Hume sneers. Most of them begged their bread, and many slept in the holes of the city walls.

Writing to Pope Martin V the learned Netter of Walden, confessor of Henry V, a bitter opponent of Wiclif, was "wonderfully astonished at his most strong arguments, with the authorities which he had assembled, and with the vehemence and force of his reasons." Henry Knyghton, Canon of Leices-

ter, though vehemently opposed to Wiclif, yet says, "He was the most eminent doctor of theology in those days; in philosophy he was second to none; in scholastics incomparable; transcending all in subtlety of mind and depth of thought; by the great mass of theologians he was considered almost like a god."

## II. THE PATRIOT.

Hard pressed by his subjects, King John Lackland on May 15, 1213, at Dover formally resigned the crowns of England and Ireland into the hands of Pandulf, and received them again as the Pope's feudatory, as if England had been the property of Innocent III, and, in return, promised a yearly rent of 1000 marks. Since the death of Pope John XXII, in 1334, no tribute was paid; Benedict XII indeed demanded it, but it was refused. In June, 1357, three cardinals came to England and asked for Pope Urban V the 1000 marks tribute, 700 for England and 300 for Ireland, and also the arrears for about thirty years, or else that Edward III present himself in person before the Pope as feudal superior and answer for his doings.

This was not a good time to make such demands on England. In 1346 Edward III won the glorious victory at Crécy in which his sixteen year old son, the Black Prince, killed the King of Bohemia, and, in 1356, the dazzling courage of the same Black Prince won the brilliant victory of Poitiers, in which King John of France was captured, and after the utter collapse of the French arms the Peace of Bretigny, in 1360, gave to England the fairest provinces of France, about one third of the whole kingdom. In addition Edward's old enemy, King David Bruce of Scotland, was a prisoner in England, and King Peter of Cyprus and the King of Denmark were in England imploring Edward's help in a crusade against the victorious Turk who had captured Adrianople. England was in the height of glory and power.

The popes were living in the "Babylonian Captivity" at Avignon and were the creatures of the French king, and France



had been vanquished in two glorious victories, and now to pay tribute as vassals of the Pope, who was a vassal of France, was more than English pride could endure about this time.

The Pope threatened to bring suit against the King, and in May, 1366, Edward III turned the Pope's demands over to Parliament. Parliament held that John had violated his coronation oath in receiving England from the Pope without consent of the English people; payment of tribute was refused; resistance was threatened, if need be, with all the might of England.

At this time Wiclif was Warden of Canterbury Hall and likely one of the six Masters of Arts called to Parliament by royal order, perhaps as a special royal commissioner, and as such he seems to have taken a leading part in the discussion and decision of Parliament. At any rate, an unknown monkish doctor of theology passionately defends the papal claims and calls upon Wiclif by name to disprove the monk's arguments.

In 1366 Wiclif replied to this "Mixtim Theologus" in the "Determination on Dominion," edited by Dr. R. L. Poole of Oxford, and held, 1. that the King rightly took away church endowments if the clergy abused their trust; 2. that clerical criminals were subject to the law of the land; 3. that the King rightly, for various reasons, refused tribute to the Pope, who emptied the pockets of the English people, even for the benefit of their French foes. By this spirited defense of England against the arrogant papal demands Wiclif became a national character and a popular man, the leader of a national movement against the Pope's political plans; clearly he must have been a man of affairs and a man of address. This work reminds us of Luther's writing "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation."

In the Parliament of February, 1371, the King needed 50,000 marks to carry on the war. Though the clergy had hitherto gone free, they were now taxed to help carry on the war; probably a result of Wiclif's writing. A Benedictine preached against this measure, and Wiclif defended it in his

"Civil Dominion," about 1372, edited by R. L. Poole. In this same Parliament the Commons asked that the clergy be dismissed from the high political offices, and that these be filled with laymen; the people wanted to be rid of papal government and have responsible ministers. This was also in line with Wiclif's teaching.

In sheer self-defense Parliament had to pass statutes of Mortmain, whereby the clergy were prohibited from grabbing any more land from dying Englishmen. In 1350 the statute of Provisors forbade the "Bishop of Rome" to give English church offices to "aliens who never dwell in England, and to cardinals who might not dwell there," and in general to interfere with the rights of those who had the giving of these livings and the election of bishops. In 1360 a man unable to read was made a bishop.

In 1353 another forward step in the fight against Rome's grasping greed was taken in the statute of Praemunire, which punished all those pleading in the court of the Roman bishop with forfeiture, outlawry, and imprisonment. The Pope's greed for English gold was not curbed by these laws, and, in 1374, on Lancaster's recommendation Wiclif was sent as one of the ambassadors to Bruges, the great and wealthy city of 200,000 inhabitants in Flanders, to treat with the delegates of Pope Gregory XI about the great grievances England had against the Pope for taking heavy bribes for appointing foreigners to the fat places in the English churches and letting absentees do nothing at all to earn their large salaries. Wiclif was gone from July 27 till September 14; his allowance was 20 shillings a day and expenses. For his labors at Bruges he was rewarded by the crown in November, 1375, with the sinecure Prebend of Aust in the Cathedral of Westbury in Worcester, but he declined it; his bitterest enemies never accused him of grasping worldly goods. William of Wykeham, Wiclif's opponent, was the King's private secretary and had twelve church livings and, of course, attended to none, although Pope Martin V, in the bull of May, 1365, had censured pluralities.

Heedless of English protests, the Pope went on merrily with his simony, selling good places for good money. He even had a collector traveling about with servants and six horses sending him about 20,000 good English marks every year; as if to add insult to injury, this collector of papal money was a hated and despised Frenchman, Arnold Garnier. The Pope's income from England was about five times that of the King. England's gorge rose, and, in 1376, the "Good" Parliament, of which Wiclif was probably a member, voiced the rising indignation in tones of thunder. "The brokers of the sinful city of Avignon promote for money unlearned and unworthy caitiffs to benefices of the value of a thousand marks, while the poor and learned hardly obtain one of twenty. So decays sound learning. They present aliens who neither see nor care to see their parishioners, despise God's services, convey away the treasure of the realm, and are worse than Jews or Saracens. The Pope's revenue from England alone is larger than that of any prince in Christendom. God gave His sheep to be pastured, not to be shaven and shorn."

The Pope's grasping greed for gold, everywhere seen, kindled the Reformer's keenest indignation. "Though our realm had a huge hill of gold," he said, "and never another man took therefrom but only this proud worldly priest-collector, in process of time the hill would be spent; for he is ever taking money out of our land, and rendering nothing back but God's curse for his simony, and some accursed clerk of Antichrist to rob the land more for wrongful privilege, or else leave to do God's will, which men should do without his leave." The Roman bishop who accepted the endowed protection of Constantine he considered to have introduced corruption into the church, and he boldly and passionately called upon King and Parliament to withdraw the temporal property of the church, and restore it to the early condition of Gospel purity and usefulness; for "by reducing the clergy to meekness and useful piety and ghostly travail, as lived Christ and His apostles, sin should be destroyed and holiness of life brought in and secular law

strengthened and the poor communion aided and good government, both spiritual and temporal, come again; and, what is best of all, as Christ's word would run to and fro freely everywhere, many men would wing their way to heaven."

It was Wiclif that, in 1377, attacked Arnold Garnier for violating all the oaths he took on coming to England to collect for the Pope, and thus again championed the cause of England against the Pope's corruption and tyranny, and he grew in importance and prominence as the dispute wore on.

What the journey to Rome was to do for Luther, the brief trip to Bruges did for Wiclif: it opened his eyes more widely to the corruption of the papacy. Ere this Wiclif had looked upon the Pope as a person who was only capable of wrongdoing, — a very bold saying in those days, — but now he looked upon the Pope as one actually guilty of wrongdoing.

The monk of St. Albans in his "Chronicon Angliae" says Wiclif "was an eloquent man" and preached "with great success," going from church to church, seducing many great lords of the land and many citizens of London. Some of his "crazy lies" were that the Pope had no right to excommunicate, and that no one had a right to present the church with anything in perpetuity, for God is the real owner of all things in Church and State, and all officers are not for lordship but for service.

Needless to say, sentiments like these could not for long pass without notice. At last the bishops goaded the unwilling Archbishop Sudbury to summon Wiclif to be examined as to his opinions, for "barking against the Church."

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

*(To be continued.)*



## BOOK REVIEW.

---

HANDBUCH DER DEUTSCHEN NATIONALLITERATUR von ihren ersten Anfaengen bis zur Gegenwart. Zum Gebrauch fuer den Unterricht in den oberen Klassen hoeherer Lehranstalten, sowie zum Selbstunterricht bearbeitet von *Otto Hattstaedt*, Professor am Concordia-Gymnasium zu Milwaukee, Wis. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1906. XV and 512 pages. Price, \$1.75.

The subject-matter of this book is secular, not religious. However, it would be rash to say on that account that the book is a secular book and that the publishing house which has issued it has in this instance departed from its specific usage. If anyone wishes to estimate correctly the great value of this book, he must regard it as a religious book and while reading it place himself in the position which the author occupied in its painstaking construction. American church institutions reared on the confessional basis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church are to be served by this book. Accordingly, the author has been restricted in two distinct ways in making his selections from the wealth of the productions of the national literature of Germany: he has been restricted as regards the quality and the quantity of his selections. As regards the former restriction, the German infidel has been barred from this book. Not that the authors represented in this book are all believing Lutherans,—for we find Lessing, Goethe, Schiller represented,—but no author has been permitted to speak his infidel, materialistic views to the readers of this book. As regards the latter restriction, the limited time devoted to the study of German literature in our bilingual colleges necessitated that notice be taken only of the prominent authors and their most important works. It was natural for the reviewer, and it will be natural for our readers, to compare Prof. Hattstaedt's book with the text-book in use in our college days at Ft. Wayne. A comparison of this kind shows the practical working of the principle adopted by our author. The difference between Hattstaedt and Viehoff is very great indeed, both in what either offers and in what he does not offer. To begin with, the grand total of 179 authors which Viehoff introduces by means of 716 selections, from Haller to Klaus Groth and Gottschall, has been reduced to 85 authors in Hattstaedt represented by 362 selections. Within this period Hattstaedt and Viehoff have only 144 selections in common; 218 selections, or about

two-thirds of the matter in this section, have been specially made for this book. Hence, Prof. Hattstaedt's book is by no means a mere abridgment of Viehoff or similar handbooks which have been in use in the schools. This fact appears still more strikingly when we note the importance which either author attaches to particular writers. Viehoff's selections, of course, are much in excess, as a rule, of Hattstaedt's; still 23 authors common to both have been represented in Hattstaedt by 54 selections more than the same authors have been accorded in Viehoff. Lastly, Hattstaedt is more up-to-date than the twelfth edition of Viehoff. 28 modern authors not treated by Viehoff are represented in Hattstaedt by 68 selections. Among them we find names like Schlosser, Hauff, Marheineke, Grillparzer, Klaus Harms, Caspari, Ahlfeld, Walther, Scheffel, Heyse, Dahn, Curtius, Mommsen, Moltke, Bismarck, Freytag, Bettex, Reuter. — The process of elimination has been vigorously applied for the reasons stated above. And it has been applied fairly. If we choose Heine, merely for convenience' sake, as a dividing line between Haller and the most recent of the writers represented in Viehoff, we find that Prof. Hattstaedt has dropped from Viehoff's array 46 authors earlier and 49 authors later than Heine. Naturally, the individual German has his favorites among the authors of his nation, and accordingly widely divergent wishes would probably be presented by different persons as to what should have been embodied in this book and what not. It is plain that the author could not possibly have met these wishes. We are satisfied that he has proceeded without partiality. None of the authors eliminated is of such importance, considering the limitations under which the author worked, that his absence would mar the effect of the whole. All points considered, we believe that the student who is guided by this handbook will obtain a view of the national literature of Germany sufficiently wide as regards extent and range, and sufficiently exact and minute as regards details. — The averages quoted for the period following Haller apply equally to the period prior to this writer. — Prose and poetry have not been treated in separate parts of the book, as in Viehoff, but each of the respective writers has been exhibited in his place by selections in either form. — The introductory remarks, historical and philological, at the heads of periods are plain and pointed. The growth and development of German literature, the various influences which have affected it from within or without, are correctly shown. The biographical notes are brief and concise. Appendix I is devoted to poetic productions in the leading German dialects. Appendix II treats the German adage. Appendix III is a brief sketch of prosody

in which the author follows the text-books of Cremer, Sommert, Lange, and others.—The index answers its purpose well.

What interests us more than the material make-up of the book is its spirit. That twenty pages of well-chosen matter have been devoted to Luther we regard not only as an act of courtesy to the prospective readers of this book, but as an act of justice to an author without whose labors the second golden age of German literature cannot be conceived of. Had Luther's lead been followed by German literates, the second golden age of the literature of Germany would have come earlier than it did. But it is quite congenial to us to find Klopstock's *Messias* placed at the head of this period rather than his *Wingolf*, and to see Herder's verdict ("The *Messias* is the first classical book in our language since Luther's translation of the Bible") endorsed. We cite Prof. Hattstaedt's opinions of the leading German authors. Of Wieland he says: "From a pious enthusiast he became transformed into an advocate of the gratification of the sensual instincts. Accordingly, not much can be said in favor of his numerous writings. Far too often they are in a frivolous, light vein and have proved a veritable poison to thousands." (p. 133.) Voss' *Louise* is pronounced a rationalistic product. (p. 138.) The cheerful, soulful manner of Claudius, his popular style and refreshing humor are praised, and his *Chria* is offered among the selections. (p. 150.) Lessing's influence as critic is fully acknowledged, but his hostile attitude over and against Christianity is also shown. "Lessing has gained ill repute for himself in all Christian circles by his 'theological writings' falsely so called. The occasion for them arose when he had published the *Fragments of Anonymus*, an infidel production containing fierce attacks upon Christianity, denying the possibility of a divine revelation and claiming sole recognition for a shallow rationalistic form of religion. . . . In this manner Lessing as an enemy of true Christianity has sown much evil seed which is bearing fruit even in our time." (p. 153.) Herder's *Letters for the Promotion of Humanity* the author regards as "a sorry testimony for his religious position. By means of them Herder is revealed as an apostle of 'humanity.' Being a full-fledged rationalist, to whom the biblical doctrine of the original depravity of the human race and the need of redemption and reconciliation with God, also of regeneration and renewal, remained sealed mysteries, Herder understands by 'humanity' the development by the natural powers in man of that happy disposition to attain perfection which is innate in man. Gervinus is correct in stating that Herder has arrayed the concept of humanity against that of Christianity. In his *Ideas* he combated

purposely the pride which he assumed in Christians, claiming that it caused them to make 'their world the center of the universe.' His tendency was toward a universal religion, a form of Christianity modeled after Christ, 'the darling of Jehovah,' 'the simple, pure, ideal man.' Christianity in his view was nothing more than a conscientious performance of every duty, human benevolence, philanthropy, in a word, a humanitarian religion." (p. 168.) The greatness and manysidedness of Goethe are fully exhibited by characteristic productions, covering seventeen pages. Our author adds this verdict to his biographical note: "It is a pity that Goethe has wasted his magnificent gifts also upon unworthy subjects. While the splendor and truth of his productions are admirable, and the euphony and simplicity of his diction are glorious, his subject-matter is often repulsive, because it is foul. And it is just as great a pity that in some of his most famous writings there is revealed a spirit of self-glorification which derides the humility and self-abasement of Christians. Accordingly, his *Faust*, e. g., can never satisfy us, because the hero in this drama does not choose the way of repentance for the canceling of his guilt. Goethe in a letter to Lavater has termed himself a 'determined non-christian.' Being such, he was, of course, disinclined to regard repentance as the only way of atonement. Goethe was a pantheist. He refused to acknowledge the triune God. He worshiped in nature, 'all-creating, ever-working nature,' the god to whom he felt himself obligated for everything. Accordingly, the main principle of his life was 'to enjoy life, not scrupling about eternity and God.' However, he confessed towards the close of his life that he had failed to find satisfaction in his gospel of nature; for he stated: 'I can honestly say that during the seventy-five years of my life I have hardly found true gratification for four weeks. My life has been the ceaseless pushing of a stone which had to be lifted again and again.'" (p. 181.) From the author's remarks regarding Schiller we quote the following: "Schiller was the poet of the ideal. Full of enthusiasm for 'the true, the good, and the beautiful,' which he failed to find in a barren world 'ruled by a merciless fate,' he created for himself a world of sublime ideals in accordance with his notions of right, liberty, and morality, and to model life after these ideals he regarded as the mission of art, especially of poetry. No doubt, by his enthusiasm he exerted a powerful influence upon the nation, especially upon young minds. However, since the force by which he endeavored to improve the world was not God's Word but art, it is just as undoubtedly true that he contributed nothing to the true advancement of the nation. Nor did



art bring him personal happiness or give him peace at heart; for Christian faith remained a mystery to him. The divine revelation he considered an impossibility, and hence he saw in Christianity nothing but the exhibition of a 'beautiful sort of morality.' 'Viewed thus,' he writes in a letter to Goethe, August 17, 1795, 'Christianity is the only aesthetic religion, and hence I can understand why this religion meets with so much success among women and is still found to exist only in them in a somewhat tolerable form.'" (p. 200.) We have not the space to extend our account of these details. As a matter of interest we wish to report that Walther is represented by a portion of a sermon on the miracles of Jesus, and Broemel's well-known opinion of Walther is quoted in the biographical note.—In making his selections Prof. Hattstaedt has, as far as practicable, avoided the realm of pure fancy. He prefers the realm of reality. The historical romance, the ballad, the epic, the epigram, are justly favored in this book. The lyrics offered are chaste and elevating. The prose selections have been made with a view to increase the student's stock of general knowledge while exhibiting to him what there is of true art in the written thought of Germany's best authors.

Prof. Hattstaedt has undertaken a task which, as far as we know, has not been approached by any one before him. A new way had to be blazed through a forest, as it were,—a way which would lead the traveler to the most advantageous points from which to view the beauties of German poetry and prose. It has been a laborious undertaking, entailing constant, patient application, careful, critical weighing and reweighing of a thousand nice points, and an evenly maintained effort to say all that must be said without saying too much. This task has been performed in a manner to bring credit both to the author and the publisher. Though not a theological work, this handbook of Prof. Hattstaedt easily takes a high rank among the products of our Concordia press during the year just closed. Its mission is limited to a smaller circle of individuals than that of many other books issued with our trademark, but it is just as important as the study in the curricula of our colleges which it strives to serve. Moreover, it offers delightful reading-matter to the average reader of literature, and to the person who wishes to inform himself on the subject of German literature it will prove a very acceptable guide by its many explanatory footnotes. In every way we are pleased with this handbook and wish it large and increasing success. May it be the precursor of similar text-books on other branches of study pursued in our colleges, by equally competent authors.

---

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL? Second Edition. By *William Dallmann*.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE UNCHRISTIAN. By *William Dallmann*. Third Edition. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. Price, 5 cents the copy, or \$1.00 the hundred for each tract.

Sound Scriptural argument, telling documentary evidence, well grouped and forcibly applied, and a plain and pointed diction render these two little tracts very valuable. No person with a conscience, after reading them, can affiliate with either body named in the above titles, and be at peace with himself.

---

THE ABRIDGED TREASURY OF PRAYERS. An Epitome from the Larger "Gebets-Schatz" Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa. 179 pp. 12mo. Price: @ 30 cts.; dozen, @ 25 cts.; hundred, @ 23 cts.

This book contains 103 prayers, 7 preparatory, 16 for morning and evening devotion, 20 for use on festival days, 9 for various needs in domestic life, and the remainder covering a variety of ordinary and extraordinary situations in all ages, various occupations, relations, seasons, and afflictions. Eight standard hymns and a Form for Emergency Baptism have been appended. Luther, Cubach, and the Marburg Hymnal, are the authors favored mostly in this selection. The contents of these prayers are well known in our circles. The new garb in which these old friends appear fits them well. We welcome them heartily.

---

A CHURCH HISTORY FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, by *Nils Loevgren*, Bishop of Vesteras. With a Series of Biographies by *August Edman*, Adjunct at Lulea "H. Allm. Laeroverk." Translated by *M. Wahlstroem* and *C. W. Foss*. Rock Island, Ill. Augustana Book Concern. 358 pp. Price, \$1.50.

This book will be taken up with delight; it will be read with increasing interest; and it will be laid aside with regret. It pos-

sesses many good qualities, so that it gives one pain to be forced to say, in the end, that it is insufficient, because it is sadly deficient in the one essential of a good history: sound judgment and fairness. This deplorable defect appears most glaringly in that section of the book which should render it most valuable to the narrower circle of its prospective readers, the Lutherans. The chapter on the Lutheran Church in America, in particular, is so manifestly partisan that we would seriously propose, in the interest of future purchasers of the book, that its title-page be amended to read: "A Church History for the Use of Swedish Schools and Colleges within the General Council of the Lutheran Church of America." As it reads now, the title fits the contents about as well as a No. 8 hat would fit a No. 6 head.

Writing the story of the Church for the benefit of our academic youths below the university grade is a task worthy of a genius. As to its contents, we imagine a book of this kind should be constructed on the eclectic plan: each age should be exhibited in its characteristic features and prominent actors. The book should aim at being perfect without striving to be complete. It should relate not all that can be said, but only what must be said to the beginner in this branch of study. The entire historical panorama should be brought within confines to be easily encompassed by a youthful mind. A very simple plan should be adopted. The historical matter should not be divided up among a bewildering multitude of eras, epochs, periods, phases, etc. The development of the Church might be shown in the three aspects of Formation, Deformation, and Reformation. Under the first head the series of marvelous events would be related, which began with the tale of shepherds in Judea in the reign of Herod the Great and ended with the overthrow of paganism in cultured Europe, Asia, and Africa. Here we behold the planting of the mustard seed; we witness the revolt of the kings of the earth against the Lord's Anointed; we see the mystical body of Christ undergoing the same fate as His natural body: the Church stands before us as an object of universal scorn; she is lashed until she is bleeding from a thousand wounds; she is despised and rejected by men; she is beset by the heathen from without and false brethren from within, yet she rises triumphant from the sands of the arena and the ashes of the pyre, even as her Lord had burst the bonds of death. And finally, we behold her conquering the Roman's love of might by the Christian's might of love. The proud Caesar bends before the pale Galilean, penitent but glad at his own defeat. At the same time, a still mightier struggle is going on within the Church: the war of words, the battle of ideas, the fierce conflict of error with

truth. The serpent has entered Eden again, whispering: "Yea, hath God said?" The Church is locked in deadly struggle with the arch-liar who is conjuring up against her the Montanist, the Donatist, the Monarchian, the Gnostic, the Manichean, the Arian. She suffers the bruising of her heel, but she crushes the serpent's head. She comes out of every controversy purer as to the *fides quae creditur* and surer as to the *fides qua creditur*. Silently, slowly, steadily, she develops her magnificent resources; her many-sided activities assume definite shape and form. Christian church-life is beginning to leaven the nations. The Church has been established. And then the view changes. A new era has begun. Across the face of this era there is written in all directions the one word ROME. It is Rome at the altar swinging the censer, Rome in the panoply of war storming trenches and steeping her hands in gore, Rome in the councils of kings, Rome in the halls of the guilds, Rome in the booth of the trader at a town-fair, Rome in the judge's seat, Rome in the professor's chair, Rome receiving ambassadors from, and dispatching nuntios to, foreign courts, Rome dictating treaties to nations and arranging the cook's menu, Rome labeling the huckster's cart and the vintner's crop, Rome levying a tax upon the nuptial bed, Rome exacting toll at the gate of heaven. And first it is Rome conquered, next Rome conquering, that is exhibited to our gaze. From the northern fastnesses of Europe and across its eastern steppes there rolls in upon the wealthy, proud, and refined peoples that fringe the Mediterranean a huge tidal wave of barbarism. The ancient civilization goes down before it. The sun of imperial Rome sets amid a tempest. And the wreck of the state seems to involve the ruin of the Church. A Roman bishop is a suppliant before a barbaric chieftain. But silently, shrewdly vanquished Rome, in the holy garb of a priest, sets to work to regain the power of her Caesars. Out of the wreck of imperial Rome rises papal Rome. Once more, though through different agents, the city of the seven hills is ruling an *orbis terrarum Romanus*. The rule extends through nearly a thousand years. How deftly do cunning priests manipulate every means to increase their power! Learning, wealth, beauty, art, piety,—everything is used as an asset in the ambitious game for absolute supremacy which the mitred vicegerent of Christ is playing against the world. Rome's ancient *pontifex maximus* had been a tool of the consuls and the Caesars; the new pontiff makes the Caesars his tools. Princes kiss his feet and hold the stirrup for him as he mounts his bedizened palfrey. An emperor stands barefoot in the snow of the pope's court-yard suing pardon for having dared to govern without



the pope's sanction. The forests of Germany are reverberating with the blows of axes which Rome's missionaries wield against Donar's oaks. The sanctuaries of pagan Germany are razed. Out of the wood of idols crosses are erected along the highways. Chapels and abbeys and cathedrals rise where the aurochs was hunted. Sturdy barbarians bend the knee at the shrines of saints. Hosts set out to see the land where the Lord had walked and suffered, and brave all dangers and hardships to wrest its possession from infidel hands. But at the place where all these activities center and whence they are being fed a shocking abomination is seen: Venus is worshiped, and Bacchus, and Mercurius, and Mars, while white-robed choirs chant praises to the mother of God, and clouds of incense are wafted skyward. Here is a mystery—a mystery of iniquity: the son of perdition in the temple of God! Proud, haughty Rome,—wealthy, wicked and wanton,—is filling up the measure of her wrath against the day of retribution.—Once more the view changes: Antichrist is assailed by a poor, unknown monk in far-away Saxony. "Who minds a monk? 'Tis nothing!" But lo, the monk towers like a giant, and German paladins are by his side, while a nation hangs on his lips. Tidings of great joy are again spread, from an obscure borough on the banks of the Elbe. They are borne on the wings of the wind. Now they talk about them in London, now at the headwaters of the Rhine, now in the streets of Jerusalem. Men, women, youths, are fearlessly giving the lie to priests whom they had loathed but dreaded before. Startled Rome is placed on the defensive. She is trying her gainsayers, and seems to be unaware that, in reality, she is being tried. She exhausts her power in the effort to suppress the new teaching, which is the old truth that had conquered the world once before. All to no avail. "She's judged. The deed is done." The Lord has smitten Antichrist with the breath of His mouth. The world is enjoying once more pure and abundant Gospel preaching. The Church is taking on a new aspect. A new life is throbbing in the nations. But alas! the victors may not enjoy their spoils in peace. Dissensions are beginning to divide the Church. A process of disintegration begins which splits up the forces that should be solidly arrayed against their common enemy, Rome, into hundreds of sects. Yea, many cast away the ancient faith and follow after new lights, reason and science. The emancipation from spiritual bondage secured for them by the prayers, the Scripture-study, and the trials of their forefathers has not been truly valued. A new bondage has enslaved the generation of to-day, the bondage of pride, self-assertion, self-glorification. The power of the Reformation is

still felt, and the world is still living upon its fruits, but the spirit that fired the hearts of Christians in every department of the Church's works is not felt to-day as it used to be. But the lessons of the past, if rightly read and pondered, may be a valuable aid in the rearing of a generation that prizes "the dear old Church, on prophets and apostles built, with Christ the corner-stone."—If this tale is told in the very plainest style, if no labored learning is crammed into Gordian constructions, and weighted down with still more labored footnotes, if abundant information is laid down in brief clauses, and the arrangement of events is so transparent that cause and effect are easily discernible in the progress of the story, a book will be produced that is instructive, fascinating, and educating. Such a book is a desideratum not only in the Swedish portion of our American Lutheran Church, but in every other section likewise. Trabert's book published some years ago does not meet the want fully. Such works as Mosheim's, Neander's, Gieseler's, Guericke's, Hase's, Kurtz's, all of which have been translated into English, are plainly above the grade of the college student. Even the divinity student finds it no easy task to appropriate the facts of church history by the aid of these guides,—not to mention the bias of which these authors have not always been able to rid themselves.

Now, the book before us has been excellently arranged and entertainingly written. The author has understood to bring his excellent learning down to the level of his pupils. Wherever he has had to sketch the views of parties to a controversy he has endeavored to be fair, though he has not always succeeded. He divides his book into three parts: 1. The Ancient Era (A. D. 30—600), embracing the period of the martyrs (—A. D. 324), and the period of doctrinal development. Special chapters have been devoted in this part to the constitution and cultus, the life and discipline, and the doctrine of the Church. The establishment of various church-offices, the mode of admitting members to the Church, the order and places of worship, church-festivals, life within the Church, the fixing of the New Testament canon, the rise of monasticism, the missionary work of the Church, the fatal union of Church and State, the influence of the Church upon life, the Trinitarian, Christological, and Soteriological controversies,—all these matters are exhibited in concise form. No essential feature has been overlooked, and the reader obtains a complete picture, true in the main, of this important era. The brief but adequate biographical notices which have been added to this part are valuable. Besides the chief Roman emperors we find sketches of Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Mani,

Gregory I, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Augustine. The author's opinion regarding the *libellatici* ("We must not judge them who with the most horrible tortures awaiting them faltered and fell," p. 13) seems latitudinarian. Why should we be enjoined from saying, especially to young men whose character is to be formed by their studies, that these men did wrong? For the same reason we should rather deplore than commend the large-heartedness of Origen. (p. 37.) Nor is the zeal for pure doctrine in the period of transition from the ancient to the medieval era properly criticised. (p. 88.) This zeal was rather inspired by love of power; it was the first muttering of that fanatic zeal which broke upon Christendom in peals of thunder in the popish inquisition.—The history of the Medieval Era (A. D. 600—1517) the author discusses under three heads: The Territorial Changes, the Constitution and Cultus, and the Life and Doctrine. Mohammedanism, the character of the papacy, the crusades, scholasticism, mysticism, humanism, the abortive reformatory movements are here discussed. Special accounts of the lives of Boniface, Gregory VII, and Henry IV, St. Elizabeth, St. Bridget, St. Francis, Bernard of Clairvaux, and John Huss are added to this section. Like most modern historians the author estimates the merits of the Roman Church during the Middle Ages too highly. Rome, it is held, acted as a conserving force against barbarism. She exercised outward discipline. Her saints set examples of "most selfish abnegation and the deepest piety." (p. 160.) She fostered learning and art. The Church of God existed also under popery, and sinners were saved also in those dark ages. True, but the historian who studies ends and means, causes and effects, cannot but regard these matters partly as accidental, partly as a cunning deception, as lying signs and wonders. The Roman Church of the Middle Ages, viewed from the standpoint of the historian, is simply the papal hierarchy with all that that implies. Whatever this hierarchy lays its hands on becomes tainted. Hence we loathe also its comelier aspects, its Francis of Assisi and its St. Bridget, its monkish learning and its missionary zeal. The era which began with the passing of Romulus Augustulus and closed with the Diet of Worms has preserved what good traits there are in it in spite of Rome. Accordingly, we could wish some of the illustrations in this part out of the book. The world still has reason to heed Luther's solemn warning: *Deus vos impleat odio papae!*—In the third, or Modern Era the author presents the history of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland and the Catholic Counter Reformation up to the Council of Trent and the preparations for the Form of

Concord. Next follows an account of the fortunes of the Lutheran Church, its territory, its internal development, doctrinal controversies, orthodoxy and pietism, the period of illumination, the nineteenth century. Schleiermacher, Claus Harms, and Fliedner are the last historical characters mentioned in this section. The next chapters treat, in the order named, the Reformed Church (in all countries), the Sects (Mennonites, Socinians, Arminians, Baptists, Quakers, Herrnhuters, Methodists, Swedenborgians, Irvingites and Darbyites, Mormons), the Roman Catholic Church (Jansenism and Jesuitism), and the Greek Church. So far the work of Bishop Lövgren extends. The rest is an American supplement (p. 300—348) and treats the religious denominations of America, the Lutheran Church in America, and the propagation of the Gospel. — Naturally, to a Lutheran, this third section is the most interesting in the entire book. The story of the Lutheran Church has been told in a fascinating way. Luther is plainly a congenial figure to the author. However, he also inclines, like most modern writers, to the opinion that Luther was at times needlessly harsh. This censure—for it is that—never fails to strike us as prudish. We imagine an aesthetic miss viewing at a safe distance the battle of Gettysburg through her field-glass and exclaiming: How horrid! Why, those men are actually killing each other! So they are; and that is what they are there for. A person who can charge Luther with rash and ruthless conduct simply has failed to grasp the situation that confronted Luther. From the same press which has issued Lövgren's History there has come to us in these days the following excerpt from Tholuck which has been transferred to the pages of the *Augustana Journal*. Tholuck writes on "Luther's rashness." He says: "What would have become of the Church if the Lord's servants and prophets had at all times done nothing else but spread salves upon sores and walk softly?" He introduces Luther in his own defense: "On one occasion, when asked by the Margrave Joachim I, why he wrote against the princes, he returned the beautiful answer: 'When God intends to fertilize the ground, He must needs send first of all a good thunder-storm, and afterwards slow and gentle rain, and thus make it thoroughly productive.' Elsewhere he says: 'A willow-branch may be cut with a knife and bent with a finger, but for a great and gnarled oak we must use an ax and a wedge;' and again: 'If my teeth had been less sharp, the Pope would have been more voracious.' 'Of what use is salt,' he exclaims in another passage, 'if it do not bite the tongue? or the blade of a sword unless it be sharp enough to cut?' Does not the prophet say, 'Cursed be he that doeth the



work of the Lord deceitfully, and keepeth back his sword from blood'?" — On page 199 f. the author contrasts the genius of Luther with that of Zwingli. Of the latter he says: "He had come to a more liberal view and truer conception of Christianity." "While Luther proceeded from the material principle of the Reformation and made it his chief aim to bring men to a life of faith and joy to the Lord, Zwingli proceeded from the formal principle and made it his chief object to lift men out of the darkness of ignorance and superstition. In outward changes, as for instance, in the order of service and the like, *Zwingli was quite radical* [*italics our own!*] and removed everything which was not enjoined in the Word of God. Luther would hear of no other means for the establishment of the Reformation than the preaching of the Word and the right administration of the Sacraments, while Zwingli did not think it wrong for the state to use force for the spread of the Gospel." Question: Does this prove Zwingli's "more liberal view and truer conception of Christianity"? The passage is a *lucus a non lucendo*. And for a Lutheran to deny to Luther a grasp of the formal principle of the Reformation equal to his grasp of the material is a *testimonium paupertatis*. The author imputes Augustine's doctrine of predestination to "all the reformers." He says: "Luther never formally renounced this doctrine." (p. 232.) Augustine's doctrine he has sketched thus: "God, who according to His justice must punish sin, *has of His great love out of the great mass of lost humanity chosen a few who shall be saved*. With these His grace works with irresistible power for their conversion and preservation in faith. On all the rest the grace of God does not work at all, or at least not in full earnest, and they are as a result lost." (p. 78.) This statement does justice neither to Augustine nor to Luther. So much is true that Augustine in his "City of God" (ch. 1) and in his "Enchiridion" (ch. 100) treats predestination as a generic term, embracing the reprobation of the damned. We are more concerned about Luther. To impute to him views like those cited is an outrage. To cite only one statement, Luther says: "Human reason feigns to believe a partial will in God, as though God were a tyrant, who has a few fellows whose condition He suffers to please Him, no matter whether it is good or bad, while He hates others, no matter what they do. *Such thoughts regarding the will of God we are not to entertain.*" (X, 1001.) — In general we find, as the author proceeds from Luther to Flacius, the Form of Concord, the period of orthodoxism, etc., that modern influence is more and more betrayed. His judgment on the theologians of the Form of Concord and during the pietistic disturbances is not exactly that of Heppe, but approaches the spirit of Tholuck, despite the attempts

to be fair which he makes by pointing out the evil tendencies of pietism, which has become the historic road to rationalism. — We have one more remark to offer with reference to the American Supplement. It was certainly a practical idea to append a brief outline of the American Lutheran Church. Nor have we any fault to find because the lion's share of this outline went to the Swedish part of the Church, because the book appears to have been intended for Swedes. But it is a serious fault *in a historian* to attempt to write even an outline of the history of our Church in America without due regard to the part which the Synodical Conference has played in rearing the American Lutheran Church. We are prepared for the charge of partisan motive in making the above remark. Whoever wishes to impute that motive, let him do so. We have merely a reviewer's interest in this matter. The history of the American Lutheran Church prior to 1830 is a rather sorry exhibition of Lutheran ignorance and indifference, and the Swedish portion of it is the sorriest of all, for it records, in the main, Lutheran losses and Episcopalian or Methodist gains. Real, stirring history begins with the founding of the Ohio, Missouri, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and the Norwegian Synods. These synods, whether in union or in conflict, have made the Lutheran Church to stand for a definite and distinct concept in doctrine and practice, and by their arduous labors in the study and in the wide field of congregational activities, church extension, etc., have lifted American Lutheranism out of the state of desuetude into which it had sunk in the days when the revivalist and the latitudinarian were dominant, and Lutherans solemnly resolved that the Augsburg Confession is, in a manner, correct. In a history we look for something better than statistical tables showing the relative greatness of this or that organization. The remark concerning the Missouri Synod ("On the subject of election the doctrinal position of the synod approaches very closely to Calvinism," p. 320) is not history but gossip which the American supplementers were childish enough to believe. *The Lutheran Witness* and the *Evangelisk Luthersk Kirketidende* already have repelled the charge.

---

THE LUTHERANS IN AMERICA. Their Heroic Past and Their Promising Future. By Rev. C. Kunzmann, D. D. 40 pp. Church Register Co., Greensburg, Pa. 1906. Price, 10 cts. per copy.

This is an amusing brochure, and the amusing part is that the author is "in dead earnest," to borrow a slang phrase. Having traced



the Reformation and the discovery of America to the Mohammedan invasion of Europe, he proceeds to tell anecdotes about the Lutheran Church in our country. He reviews the periods of exploration, colonization, revolution, and the Civil War down to the present time. Grave and trivial matters are jumbled with no attempt at discriminating between events which really stand in a causative relation to the present status of the American Lutheran Church, and such as are mere way-side happenings. Henry Muhlenberg's coming is related with as much fervor as Peter Muhlenberg's very questionable act of quitting his holy office to follow the drums of Washington. At no place does the author put forth the least effort to expound the essential characteristics of his church, to point to her chief glory, the heritage of divine truth and Scriptural teaching bequeathed to her. But he is a veritable genius in noting the least public distinction that has come to any of her members. He has discovered that in sixteen matters Lutherans were first in point of time. Among heroic feats of Lutherans in the past he records the ringing of Liberty Bell by a Lutheran sexton, the baking of a full-weight loaf by a Lutheran baker in Washington's campaigns, etc. This exhibition of Lutheran greatness will command no respect among thinking men. It is simply addressed to the galleries. The Lutheran future, if anything, is pictured still more unhappily. The author is a Pan-Lutheranist. Witness the following: "We expect the Pan-Lutheran Convention to prepare the way for a Pan-Lutheran Confederation and a world-wide activity. Of this we are convinced. (Sic!) As goes the Lutheran Church in America, so goes the Lutheran Church in the world. And as goes America, so goes the world. I behold a vision. Before me stands America." Etc. This vision extends through three pages. A voice from heaven is heard. The General Council is seen standing in the center of the religious forces of the world. Gustav Freytag, Talmage, and President Roosevelt are admiringly pointing to the Lutheran Church. There are "voices, in increasing number and volume, calling, calling, calling" to the Lutheran Church, and so on. Of course, the galleries are again in a frenzy at this unblushing and premeditated—*Schwaermerei*. And the author of this brochure has been assigned a position in his church-body which requires the soberest, calmest, most practical and matter-of-fact mind, that of Superintendent of Missions!

---